

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-15

H.R. 6870

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 6870.....	1
Digest of Public Law 85-15.....	2

Index and summary of H. R. 6870

- Apr. 12, 1957 House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 6870 without amendment. Print of bill and report.
- Apr. 15, 1957 House passed H. R. 6870 with amendments.
(Bill as passed by House not printed).
- Apr. 16, 1957 Senate committee reported H. R. 6870 with amendments. S. Rept. No. 234. Print of bill and Senate passed H. R. 6870 as reported. Print of bill as passed by Senate.
House concurred in Senate amendments.

Approved: Public Law 85-15

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-15

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1957. Provides funds for the Agriculture Department in the following amounts: Not to exceed \$950,000 for plant and animal disease and pest control, to be derived by transfer from the appropriations available to the Department for the 1957 fiscal year; \$5,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 to be transferred from other appropriations available to the Department for the 1957 fiscal year, for salaries and expenses of fighting forest fires; and \$200,000,000 additional for Rural Electrification loans to be borrowed from the Treasury.

Provides \$250,000,000 for Federal-aid highways, \$900,000 for public lands highways, and \$1,500,000 for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services.

APRIL 12, 1957

16. ECONOMY. Sen. Byr inserted a resolution by the Finance Committee on their proposed investment of the financial condition of the U.S., including credit and interest rates. p. 5000

17. RECESSED until Mon., Apr. 15. p. 5043

HOUSE

H.R. 6870, H. Rept. 350

18. SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill. All items applicable to the Department of Agriculture were reported as proposed in the budget estimates and are as follows:

Agricultural Research Service, Salaries and Expenses, Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control -- not to exceed \$950,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriations available to the Department for the fiscal year 1957.

Forest Service, Salaries and Expenses, Fighting Forest Fires -- an additional amount of \$5,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 to be transferred from other appropriations available to the Department for the fiscal year 1957.

Rural Electrification Administration, Rural Electrification Loans -- an additional amount of \$200,000,000 to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury and to be made available by transfer from the loan authorization (for farm housing loans) contained in section 606 (a) of the Act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020, 84th Congress).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

19. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Tollefson inserted the results of a poll taken in the sixth Congressional district of Wash. on a number of subjects, including continuance of price support programs, continuance of the foreign aid program, balancing the budget, and retaining import quotas. pp. A2921-22
20. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Smathers inserted a newspaper report on a speech by the president of the American Stock Exchange urging investment bankers to give small business firms more assistance in raising equity capital. pp. A2927-28
21. HOUSING. Sen. Smathers inserted a Wall Street Journal article stating that March housing starts dipped to the lowest annual rate in eight years, builders were demanding government action, and that Administration officials say it is up to Congress to provide relief. pp. A2931-32
22. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smathers inserted a newspaper article favoring curtailment of the foreign aid program, and charging "waste and folly" in the application of foreign aid funds. p. A2935

BILLS INTRODUCED

23. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 1855, by Sen. Cooper, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, in order to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to undertake certain financing activities and to require certain payments to the United States; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 4981-2
- S. 1869, by Sen. Kerr, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to Public Works Committee.

24. DISTRESSED AREAS. S. 1854, by Sen. Flanders, to amend the Employment Act of 1946 as amended so as to establish a National Development Priorities Council; to Banking and Currency Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 4980-1
25. ANTIDUMPING. S. 1860, by Sen. Byrd, to amend certain provisions of the Anti-Dumping Act, of 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof; to Finance Committee.
26. PATENTS. S. 1862, by Sen. O'Mahoney, to establish the Patent Office as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to Government Operations Committee.

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED IN THIS OFFICE

27. HOUSING. Housing Act of 1957. House Banking and Currency Committee.
28. APPROPRIATIONS. Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1958, Statements of Members of Congress, Organizations, and Interested Individuals. House Appropriations Committee.
Treasury Department appropriations for 1958. House Appropriations Committee.

- 0 -

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Apr. 12 (additional): Meat promotion bill, H. Agriculture (exec) (Bucy, OGC, to give technical assistance).

Apr. 15: Study of CCC sales policy, H. Banking and Currency (Berger, Richards, Palmby, and Daniels, CSS, and Shulman, OGC, to testify). Inspection and labeling of potatoes, H. Agriculture (Grange and Hedlund, AMS, to testify). USDA appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec) (CSS to testify). Area redevelopment bills, S. Banking.

oOo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105-A.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

APRIL 12, 1957.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

MR. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 6870]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations to supply certain urgent deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are certain of those contained in House Document No. 115 upon which action is urgently needed at this time. The bill is divided into chapters corresponding to the subcommittees considering the estimates. The recommendations contained in the bill are a result of deliberations of the several subcommittees as approved by the full committee.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Budget estimates considered by the committee total \$55,100,000. Appropriations recommended total \$48,990,000, a reduction of \$6,110,000. These amounts are distributed by chapters of the bill as indicated in the following table:

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
I	Agriculture.....	¹ (\$200, 950, 000)	¹ (\$200, 950, 000)	-----
II	Commerce.....	² 1, 000, 000	² 900, 000	--\$100, 000
III	Interior (Forest Service).....	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	-----
IV	Justice.....	300, 000	300, 000	-----
V	Health, Education, and Welfare.....	³ 1, 500, 000	³ 1, 500, 000	-----
VI	Post Office.....	47, 000, 000	41, 000, 000	--6, 000, 000
VII	Legislative.....	300, 000	290, 000	--10, 000
	Total.....	55, 100, 000	48, 990, 000	--6, 110, 000

¹ By transfers from existing funds.

² In addition, \$250,000,000 payable from highway trust fund.

³ In addition, \$24,500,000 payable from OASI trust fund.

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi, *Chairman*

FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
JAMES B. BOWLER, Illinois

H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington
CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Plant and animal disease and pest control.—Under this heading the bill includes the full budget estimate of \$950,000 contained in H. Doc. 115. This additional fund is provided to assist ranchers in the control of heavy grasshopper infestations on approximately 4 million acres of rangelands and abandoned croplands in the Western States during the next three months. It is proposed to obtain this money by transfer from other appropriations of the Department where personnel savings can be made.

A serious problem is developing in the Southern part of the country in connection with an insect known as the "fire-ant." The Committee feels that the Department should begin immediately to work out the necessary approach with the States, landowners, and others to meet this serious threat to the crops and livestock of this area on a cooperative basis. Legislation is now pending which will provide a formula for the Department to institute the necessary control measures.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorizations.—Provision is made in the bill for an additional \$200,000,000 for electrification loans. The budget estimate contained in H. Doc. 115 proposed to provide this amount by transfer from farm-housing loan authorizations included in the Housing Act of 1956. This provision is carried in the bill.

A recent survey of firm needs for electrification loan funds indicates that applications totalling \$453 million will be processed during fiscal year 1957. Approximately \$240 million is now available from the regular 1957 bill and a carryover from previous years. The additional amount in this bill will provide a total of \$440 million to meet this demand.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE			
115	Plant and animal disease and pest control ¹ -----	(\$950, 000)	(\$950, 000)	-----
	RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION			
115	Loan authorizations ² -----	(200, 000, 000)	(200, 000, 000)	-----
	Total, Chapter I -----	(200, 950, 000)	(200, 950, 000)	-----

¹ Transfer of \$950,000 from appropriations for fiscal year 1957 available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses.

² Budget estimate proposing transfer from farm housing loan authorization contained in Housing Act of 1956 carried in bill.

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE

PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia, *Chairman*

ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania

CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
WALT HORAN, Washington
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Federal-aid highways (trust-fund).—The full budget estimate of \$250,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 115, is recommended in the accompanying bill as an appropriation from the Highway Trust Fund.

Testimony presented to the Committee indicates that unpaid commitments made under the contract authorizations provided by the Highway Act total \$2,009,000,000 as of April 1, 1957. The sum of \$800,000,000 was appropriated in the fiscal year 1957. The amount included in this bill will provide a total of \$1,050,000,000 to reimburse the States for the Federal share of highway projects initiated under these commitments.

Receipts into the Highway Trust Fund total \$1,109,000,000 as of April 1, 1957.

Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization).—An appropriation of \$900,000 is proposed in the bill, a decrease of \$100,000 in the budget estimate contained in H. Doc. 115.

The Highway Act authorizes \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1957 for this program. Of the \$1,000,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1957, \$625,000 was required to liquidate contracts entered into under 1956 authorizations. The amount recommended in this bill, together with the balance of the 1957 regular appropriation, will provide a total of \$1,275,000 to liquidate commitments under the \$3,000,000 contract authorization for fiscal year 1957. The balance of \$1,725,000 will be financed from funds recommended in the regular 1958 bill plus funds to be provided subsequent thereto.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS			
115	Federal-aid highways (trust fund)-----	(\$250, 000, 000)	(\$250, 000, 000)	-----
115	Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)---	1, 000, 000	900, 000	-\$100, 000
	Total, Chapter II-----	1, 000, 000	900, 000	-\$100, 000

CHAPTER III

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

SUBCOMMITTEE

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey

DON MAGNUSON, Washington

BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa

IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania

HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fighting forest fires.—Extreme drought conditions and a high occurrence of lightning have resulted in severe fire conditions, primarily in Arizona, New Mexico, and southern California, necessitating the spending of an estimated \$11,750,000 for fire control during 1957. In addition to the \$5,250,000 made available in the regular 1957 appropriation, it has been necessary, in accordance with the provisions of law, for the Forest Service to advance funds totalling \$5,217,000 from other appropriations for emergency fire fighting purposes.

The recommended amount of \$6,500,000, the same as the Budget estimate, will permit the return of the borrowed funds required for the purposes for which appropriated and will provide for emergency fire fighting for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Of the total request of \$6,500,000, the Committee recommends that \$1,500,000 be absorbed by transfer from appropriations currently available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses as proposed in the Budget estimate.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	FOREST SERVICE			
	SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
115	Fighting forest fires.....	\$5, 000, 000 1 (1, 500, 000)	\$5, 000, 000 1 (1, 500, 000)	----- -----
	Total, Chapter III.....	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	-----

¹ To be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants).

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*

PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
DON MAGNUSON, Washington

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
CLIFF CLEVINGER, Ohio

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

The bill includes an additional \$300,000, the amount of the budget estimate, for this item to cover the cost of increased mileage and per diem rates authorized by Public Law 875, approved August 1, 1956. This law authorized a per diem increase from \$5.00 to \$8.00 and mileage from 7¢ to 8¢. The amount provided in this bill together with the \$1,450,000 previously appropriated will make a total of \$1,750,000 available for fees and expenses of witnesses.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
115	Fees and expenses of witnesses-----	\$300, 000	\$300, 000	-----

CHAPTER V

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana

JOHN TABER, New York
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Grants to States and other agencies.—The bill includes \$1,500,000, the full amount of the request. This will be in addition to \$38,000,000 already appropriated. For purposes of section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, allotments to the States are authorized to be made on the basis of \$45,500,000, however, only \$33,500,000 was included in the 1957 appropriation for these purposes since the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation estimated that the States would not have sufficient funds to match more than this amount. Due to some States appropriating larger sums than were estimated, it is now obvious that approximately \$1,500,000 of additional Federal funds will be needed to match State funds in accordance with the formula set forth in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.—The bill includes an increase in the administrative expense limitation for this Bureau from \$97,000,000 to \$121,500,000, the full amount requested. All of these funds come from the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund rather than from the general funds of the Treasury. This increase is necessary to permit the handling of the greatly increased workload resulting from the Social Security Act amendments passed by the last session of Congress, and to reduce a serious backlog of work that now exists. During recent weeks this backlog has reached such proportions that the average claimant has had to wait from 50 to 60 days from the time of filing his or her claim until it has been processed for payment.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
	OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION			
115	Grants to States and other agencies.....	\$1, 500, 000	\$1, 500, 000	-----
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
115	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors In- surance (trust fund).....	(24, 500, 000)	(24, 500, 000)	-----
	Total, Chapter V.....	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	-----

CHAPTER VI

SUBCOMMITTEE

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, *Chairman*

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey

TOM STEED, Oklahoma

GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey

EARL WILSON, Indiana

BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

OPERATIONS

The Committee considered an estimate of \$47,000,000 contained in House Document Numbered 115, and recommends an appropriation of \$41,000,000. Approval of this action by Congress will result in there being available for Operations in 1957 a total of \$2,165,730,000, which includes the result of the exercise of transfer authority by the Department, and is \$46,850,000 more than the original estimate for 1957, and \$51,290,000 more than the appropriation made by the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1957.

In spite of the increases in availability of funds by transfers, the Department has been operating at a rate of obligation which, the witness threatened, would require the cessation of postal service "completely for two weeks" in the event the request were denied.

The Committee reviewed with the Department and with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the details of the apportionment requests of the Department and the subsequent approvals by the Bureau. This review coupled with an analysis of the obligations incurred, established the fact that all operations have been geared to an inevitable deficiency. It seems abundantly clear that the Department made no effort to operate within even the augmented appropriation, and that the apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget openly gave Executive approval to this course of action, contrary to law. It must be pointed out that the very same Director of the Budget who approved the various reapportionment requests leading directly to this deficiency at the same time "specifically said I would not send up a supplemental for those amounts".

Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended in 1950, was designed to preclude the situation which now arises. In discussing the law, on the floor of the House on May 10, 1950, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Norrell) said of paragraph 1 of subsection c:

" . . . This is designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made, and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a

corporation or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

The Postmaster General requested the General Accounting Office to issue an opinion as to whether or not the law had been complied with. Today, a letter (B-131361) from the Comptroller General states, in pertinent part, as follows:

* * * The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47,000,000, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957, before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the services of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for "Operations" or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (i) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Anti-Deficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act. * * *

Although the items involved in the request all result from actions contrary to the law, a majority of the Committee feel that the necessity for maintaining service to the public is an over-riding consideration. Of the amount requested, approximately \$2,000,000 meets the test of paragraph 1 of subsection (e) as an exception to the prohibition of deficiency apportioning, the balance does not. The Committee recognizes that certain mitigating circumstances surround an additional \$17,000,000 of the estimate in that the effective date of the reclassification portion of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, although technically prior to the transmission of the estimates was, in fact, subsequent to the preparation of the estimates for printing and transmission.

The administrative decisions necessary during the interim pending approval of this appropriation have been and will continue to be unfortunate. Had these decisions been made nearly a year ago, when they should have been, the present situation would not have arisen. It is most regrettable that a service so vital to the economy of our nation, and affecting personally and individually each of our people, has thus been so callously jeopardized by the injudicious action of the Executive Branch which now seeks to escape justifiable criticism by overtly threatening the Congress.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
115	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT Operations-----	\$47, 000, 000	\$41, 000, 000	—\$6, 000, 000

CHAPTER VII

SUBCOMMITTEE

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York

WALT HORAN, Washington
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Special and select committees.—The bill includes \$290,000, a reduction of \$10,000 below the request, to supplement the regular 1957 appropriation of \$1,400,000 for expenses of special and select committee studies and investigations. Expenditures through March 31, 1957, totalled \$1,262,137, an average of about \$140,000 a month, leaving a balance of \$137,863, thus indicating need of added funds by the end of this month. The supplemental amount allowed for the remainder of the year is approximately in line with average monthly expenditures.

Expenses of special and select committee investigations are incurred only in pursuance of specific resolutions adopted by the House.

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
115	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE Special and select committees-----	\$300, 000	\$290, 000	—\$10, 000

O

Union Calendar No. 108

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

[Report No. 350]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 12, 1957

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply
5 appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Urgent
6 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”, for plant and animal disease and pest control, not to exceed \$950,000, to be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants) : *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), and the Act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148), to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the Act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020).

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for “Federal-aid highways (trust fund)”, to remain available until expended, not more than \$250,000,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT

AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for “Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)”, to remain available until expended, \$900,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Fighting forest fires”, \$5,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of

1 Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such ap-
2 propriations which include funds for grants).

3 CHAPTER IV

4 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

5 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

6 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

7 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
8 witnesses", \$300,000.

9 CHAPTER V

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

11 WELFARE

12 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

13 GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

14 For an additional amount for "Grants to States and
15 other agencies", for vocational rehabilitation services under
16 section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended,
17 \$1,500,000.

18 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

20 SURVIVORS INSURANCE

21 The amount authorized by the Department of Health,
22 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957, to be
23 expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
24 trust fund for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age

1 and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$97,000,000"
2 to "\$121,500,000".

3 CHAPTER VI

4 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

5 (Out of postal fund)

6 OPERATIONS

7 For an additional amount for "Operations", \$41,000,000.

8 CHAPTER VII

9 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

10 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

12 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

13 For an additional amount for "Special and Select Com-
14 mittees", \$290,000.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

[Report No. 350]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

APRIL 12, 1957

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 16, 1957
For actions of April 15, 1957
85th, 1st, No. 66

CONTENTS

ACP.....10	Forestry.....13,32,34	REA.....9
Appropriations.....8,9,40	Health.....30	Reclamation.....7,14,42
Budget.....5,18,31	Imports.....32	Recreation.....34
Cotton.....11	Information.....6	Research.....8,26,30
Cranberries.....38	Lands.....24,34	Savings bonds.....43
Depressed areas.....36	Legislative program.....8	Small business.....35
Education.....27	Livestock.....15	Soil conservation.....10
Electrification.....28,42	Loans, farm.....9,12	St. Lawrence Seaway.....21
Experiment station.....8	Marketing.....38	Statehood.....3,23
Farm income.....20	Meat.....15	Surplus commodities.....27
Feed grains.....39	Milk marketing.....22	Taxation.....2
Flood insurance.....19	Personnel.....4,29,41	Trade, foreign.....16
Food.....17,26	Property.....1	Watersheds.....37
Foreign aid.....25	Public debt.....31	Wheat quotas.....33

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed following bills: Second urgent deficiency appropriation. To extend 1956 price supports for extra long staple cotton. To make permanent Federal administration of ACP. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to provide self-help meat promotion program. House committee reported State-Justice appropriation bill. Sen. Symington urged transfer of Midwest Claypan Research Station to U. of Mo. Sen. Symington submitted and discussed resolution requesting USDA to make study of feed grain program.

SENATE

1. PROPERTY. Sen. Symington discussed S. 1034, to authorize this Department to transfer the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station, McCredie, Mo., to the U. of Mo. He inserted excerpts from the Committee report, and letters from the University and this Department in favor of passage. He presented an amendment to limit such conveyance to conditions set by the Secretary and urged Sen. Morse to withdraw his objection. pp. 5059-62
2. TAXATION. Sen. Wiley urged passage of S. 769, to provide a Federal Tax Commission. pp. 5054-6
3. STATEHOOD. Sen. Church inserted a letter he sent to the President urging statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. p. 5056
4. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston declared "there is . . . a glaring need for a labor-management law in Government" and cited the Justice Department's brief opposing additional benefits for Government workers. He inserted Joseph Young's column, "Justice Brief Puts Economy Above Benefits--Savings Get Priority Over Government Work Conditions." pp. 5056-7

5. BUDGETING. Sen. Johnston criticized "the mess in the Post Office Department" and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget claiming this had been a violation of the anti-deficiency law. He inserted the Comptroller General's decision, which concluded that the actions were "inconsistent with the spirit and purpose of the act," if not technically a violation. pp. 5057-9
6. INFORMATION. Sen. Williams criticized the Internal Revenue Service for issuing an order that Sen. William's letters be transmitted to Washington for a reply. p. 5059
7. RECLAMATION. S. J. Res. 12, to transfer the right-of-way for Yellowtail dam and reservoir, was made the unfinished business. p. 5052
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated the Senate would consider S. 1034, to convey the Midwest Claypan Research Station to the U. of Mo., and S. J. Res. 12, to transfer right-of-way for Yellowtail dam and reservoir, and that if the bill to provide a deficiency appropriation for the Post Office were ready it would be considered promptly. p. 5051

HOUSE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendment H.R. 6870, the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 (H. Rept. 350). (pp. ~~5077~~, 5079-99). A motion to recommit the bill was rejected by a vote of 12 to 121 (p. 5099). A point of order by Rep. Jones, Ala., to strike out the language in the bill which provided that the \$200 million for REA loans may be made available from farm housing funds, was sustained (pp. 5093-5). Also sustained was a point of order by Rep. Bow against the entire REA item because of the provision referred to by Rep. Jones (p. 5095). An amendment by Rep. Marshall, to restore the REA item without the provision regarding farm housing funds, was then agreed to by a vote of 55 to 49 (pp. 5095-6).
The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 6871, the State, Justice, Judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill for 1958 (H. Rept. 351). p. 5112
10. SOIL CONSERVATION. Passed as reported H.R. 1045, to remove the time limit on Federal administration of the ACP but to retain the authority for State administration if State plans are submitted and approved. p. 5077
11. COTTON. Passed without amendment S. 812, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to continue the price support for extra long staple cotton at the 1956 rate. A similar bill (H.R. 3654) was laid on the table. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 5078
12. FARM LOANS. Passed over, at the request of Reps. Marshall and Lanham, H.R. 3753, to enable this Department to extend financial assistance to desertland entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen. p. 5076
13. FORESTRY. Received from this Department a notice of the intention of the Departments of Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands; to Agriculture Committee. p. 5112
Received from the Interior Department proposed legislation to establish uniform procedures relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land for purposes of the national park system; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 5112
Received an Alaska Legislature memorial requesting that Alaska be granted title to its shorelands, tide and submerged lands, and its inland waters.

COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOLD THE RANK OF MAJOR GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4144) to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of major general.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," approved March 1, 1889 (D. C. Code, sec. 39-201), is amended by striking out "brigadier general" and inserting in lieu thereof "major general."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, delete all of lines 6 and 7 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "amended by inserting after 'brigadier general' the words 'or major general'."

On page 1, after line 7, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The act entitled 'An act to authorize the detail of an officer of the retired list of the Army as adjutant-general of the District of Columbia militia,' approved June 6, 1900 (D. C. Code, sec. 39-205), is amended by striking out 'brigadier-general commanding' and inserting in lieu thereof 'commanding general of.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general, or major general."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING RETIRED ANNUITIES OF MEMBERS OF THE TEACHING STAFFS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL POST GRADUATE SCHOOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5832) to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annuities, payable under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code, to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School are increased as follows: That portion of an annuity which is not in excess of \$1,500 is increased by 12 percent, and that portion of an annuity which is in excess of \$1,500 is increased by 8 percent. These increases shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase the annuity to \$4,104, and are in addition to the increases authorized by Public Law 371, 84th Congress. The monthly installments of each annuity shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 2. The increases provided by section 1, when added to the annuities of retired civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy or the United States Naval Postgraduate School, do not in-

crease the annuities of their survivors. The annuity of any such survivor, however, who is entitled to or becomes entitled to an annuity under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code, shall be increased in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commences between—	Portion of annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Portion of annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
January 16, 1936, and June 30, 1955.	12 per centum	8 per centum
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955.	10 per centum	7 per centum
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.	8 per centum	6 per centum
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956.	6 per centum	4 per centum
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.	4 per centum	2 per centum
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957.	2 per centum	1 per centum

SEC. 3. Any provision of law, enacted after the effective date of this act, which increases the annuities of retired employees and their survivors who are entitled to annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 691 et seq.), shall be applicable in like manner and to the same extent to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and of the United States Postgraduate School and their survivors who are entitled to annuities under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 1, after the words "United States" add the word "Naval."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Adair	Coudert	Healey
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Hill
Albert	Delaney	Hillings
Alger	Dellay	Holtzman
Anderson, Mont.	Dempsey	Horan
Andrews	Dies	Hyde
Anfuso	Dixon	Jackson
Arends	Dollinger	Jarman
Ashley	Donohue	Jennings
Aspinall	Dorn, N. Y.	Judd
Ayres	Doyle	Kearney
Bailey	Dwyer	Keating
Barden	Eberharter	Kelly, N. Y.
Barrett	Engle	Keogh
Bass, N. H.	Fallon	Knox
Becker	Farbstein	Krueger
Belcher	Fino	Laird
Blitch	Flynt	Landrum
Bowler	Forrester	Lankford
Boykin	Friedel	Lennon
Brooks, La.	Fulton	Loser
Buckley	Garmatz	McCulloch
Cederberg	Gordon	McDonough
Celler	Granahan	McGovern
Chudoff	Green, Pa.	Magnuson
Clark	Gregory	Martin
Colmer	Gubser	May
Cooley	Halleck	Miller, Calif.
	Harvey	Miller, Md.

Miller, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.	Riehlman	Teague, Tex.
Morano	Rivers	Teller
Morris	Rodino	Thomas
Morrison	Rogers, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Multer	Roosevelt	Tollefson
Norblad	Sadlak	Utt
Norrell	Santangelo	Vinson
O'Brien, N. Y.	St. George	Walter
O'Neill	Saund	Westland
Osmer	Scherer	Widnall
Patman	Scott, Pa.	Willis
Patterson	Shelley	Wolverton
Philbin	Smith, Calif.	Yates
Powell	Smith, Kans.	Zelenko
Radwan	Springer	
Rains	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could not get along with 1 hour or 1½ hours at the most.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the country want to know something about this. I think everybody is very much interested. I want to give an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to everybody who wants to whitewash the Postmaster General to have time to do so.

Mr. TABER. Suppose we try to limit debate to 2 hours? How about 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. I will agree to 3 hours, then.

Mr. TABER. That is a little better. I will go along with that. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent then that general debate be limited to 3 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6870, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us deals with a number of routine deficiencies and supplementals which are admissible under the antideficiency law. They are largely formal, and I shall not discuss them, as they are fully explained in the pending report of the committee.

However, there is an item in the chapter on Treasury and Post Offices which is not admissible under the antideficiency law.

Last Friday the Postmaster General arbitrarily, and in contravention of the duties imposed upon him by his office, abruptly discontinued a number of services customarily provided by the Department.

As a result we have had an opportunity to observe the effects of the extraordinary measures to which he has resorted in his determination to dictate to the Congress and the American people and take as much money as he wants from the United States Treasury to be spent as and when he wishes.

Under the Constitution no money can be appropriated except by act of Congress. The taxpayers acting through their representatives control the purse strings. But the Postmaster General changes all that and the taxeaters instead of the taxpayers take over the purse strings.

Congress appropriated enough money—over \$3 billion—to run the Department post offices for a year. They gave the Postmaster General more than he asked. But instead of making it last a year he spent it on extravagant programs during the first 9 months and now at the last minute comes in and tells Congress that unless he can have \$47 million more he will close the Department or discontinue services he is required by his official duties to provide.

He gave Congress no warning that he was running behind. The first intimation that he was overspending came the last month of the third quarter when he suddenly submits an estimate and demands immediate action by the House. The communication was referred to the Speaker to the Committee which held hearings at the earliest possible minute. The subcommittee promptly notified the Postmaster General that it would allow \$17 million additional for items which were not in violation of the antideficiency act. And when the whole committee met the amount was increased to \$41 million to include items in contravention of the Antideficiency Act. This gave him for operations alone \$2,166,000,000 when originally he had only asked for \$2,118,000,000.

Although adoption of the report for \$41 million by the committee was assurance that the money would be forthcoming as soon as it could reach the Senate and the President, he refused to withdraw his order for curtailment of service, which became effective at midnight Friday night.

There was no reason for this drastic act, unprecedented in American history, unless to cover up waste and extravagance and inefficiency in administration.

He said he had been advised by his lawyers that he would be subject to a year's imprisonment if he continued to spend money before he had it. There is no such law. But he refused to resume service, even after the allowance by the committee of \$41 million in addition to his first annual appropriation, until both Houses had passed the bill and it had been signed by the President and he had the money in his hand.

He still had left close to half a billion dollars of his first appropriation. Most of the personnel of the Department is paid by the month. They drew their pay whether they worked or not. Many of them sat all day behind closed windows when they could have been discharging their usual duties and keeping the mail service in operation. So any disadvantage or inconvenience which anyone may have suffered was due exclusively to the determination of the Postmaster to show Congress who was boss—the taxpayers or the taxeaters.

No one can now deny that the Postmaster General knew all along that he was overspending and his continued support of extravagant programs was every month making a deficiency imperative and inescapable. His continued application to the Bureau of the Budget for a deficiency estimate is proof positive of that.

The Postmaster's violation has been deliberate. He knew last July that he did not have enough money to go through the year at the rate at which he wanted to operate.

He could have cut down a slight amount at that time, spread the reduction over the entire year, and would have come out within the money given him. But he didn't want to do it that way. He was determined to set the pace and rate of spending and purpose of spending, and not Congress. He deliberately planned his operations to thwart Congress and the taxpayers. He refused to plan his operations to live within the amount Congress had given him.

Many years ago Jay Goul, a plunderer who dealt in sums infinitesimal in comparison with those juggled by the Postmaster General, when warned of losses inflicted on the public, coined that famous phrase "The public be damned." In urging the Director of the Budget to violate the law and in refusing to carry out the provisions by Congress, the Postmaster General, in the language of the Comptroller repeatedly violated both "the spirit and purpose of the law." It was another case of the public be damned.

But there can always be found some partisan to take the side of the down-trodden Postmaster General. You doubtless noted in this morning's newspaper that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], attempted to excuse him by saying that the committee "deliberately delayed action in providing the money." The first, unfortunately the RECORD does not bear out that surmise.

The Postmaster General early applied to the Bureau of the Budget for defi-

ciency estimates. Time and again he urged the Director of the Budget to bail him out. Each time he was denied and told that he must live within the amount given him by Congress. Finally the Director yielded to his importunities and sent a deficiency estimate to the House.

This was the first official notice given Congress. The Speaker referred the estimate to the committee, and an immediate hearing was ordered. The Postmaster General asked for a delay of a week, which was granted. From that time on every effort was made to accelerate the proceedings. There is no ground for the statement of the gentleman from Maine whatever for the statement which the gentleman from Maine has sent back to his district.

In the same vein, the newspapers this morning report that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] has released the statement to the press that Congress deliberately neglected to provide money for the purpose. As a matter of fact, for more than 8 months he did not come to Congress. The road was open to the President to come to Congress with a supplemental budget. But he did not come to Congress until March 12. The Postmaster General did not want to come to Congress. Congress would call him on the carpet and ask him embarrassing questions. Congress would tell him to allocate his spending and carry out his original plan, under which they had given him more than he asked. He preferred to wait until it was too late to reapportion, and then he would bludgeon Congress with the necessity of providing money to keep the Department operating. And that was what he did. This was the first official notice given Congress, and promptly a hearing was called and every action taken to expedite consideration. The hearing was ordered, but the Postmaster General himself asked for a delay of a week.

Still here is a charge that we deliberately delayed giving the money. That is just not so. The statement is not justified by the facts. The Postmaster General went ahead in deliberate violation of the spirit and purpose of the law. He failed to secure a deficiency estimate; he failed to convince the President's office of the alleged need for additional funds until March 12.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I was wondering why the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did not call a meeting of the full committee earlier last week? That is what I felt was the deliberate delay. If he had called a meeting earlier, we could have had the same discussion we are having today earlier and we would have gotten the money appropriated so that the post offices would not have had to close over the weekend.

Mr. CANNON. A meeting was called at the earliest moment, as is customary under our procedure. Friday is the customary day for the meeting of the whole committee. Time is required in which to prepare hearings and reports for consideration by the whole committee. The clerks of the committee must

have an opportunity to check, the subcommittee must have an opportunity to secure the facts, and at the very next Friday we called a meeting of the committee.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, there can be no misunderstanding of the facts here. They are fully set out in the report. We gave the Postmaster General ample funds last year. We gave him more than he asked. And he abrogates the antideficiency law, a law which it took us years to perfect; the most salutary provision in our budgetary system.

There are two fundamental questions involved here. The first is, Shall the dog wag the tail or the tail wag the dog? Shall Congress control the departments or shall the departments control Congress? Shall Congress retain its constitutional right to take money out of the Treasury or shall Congress delegate that to the departments? That is the first question.

The next question is, Shall the Government continue to take an unconscionable cut out of every man's income, out of his wages, out of his salary, out of the money upon which his family must depend? Shall it continue to levy wartime taxes in time of peace? Or shall we reduce expenses sufficiently to permit Congress to cut taxes at this session?

These are the two questions before us here this afternoon. All this hullabaloo about the Postmaster General is merely incidental. The people back home are not so much interested in Mr. Postmaster General as has been demonstrated in the last 2 days. But they are interested in what it costs them to live and support their families. They are interested in the amount of taxes you are taking away from them. And they think it is high time you took this heavy burden off their backs and permitted them to spend their own money instead of the Government letting the Postmaster General spend it contrary to law.

And, of course, there is only one way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce expenses. As long as you continue to increase expenses—and this time the Bureau of the Budget and the President asked for the Post Office Department more money than it ever had before, and now come back for \$47 million more—as long as every Department asks more money, and the President recommends more money, the only way to get that money is to take it out of the pockets of the taxpayers. There is no other source.

We hope to cut taxes this session. The House leadership has already announced a tax-reduction program for this session, now, when the people want it, when they ought to have it, when they need it. We are going to release this brake on the national economy.

But that is dependent upon one thing: It is dependent upon our cutting out of this \$71.8 billion budget, this highest of all peacetime budgets, enough money to warrant a tax-reduction bill.

Most of us came here after hard-fought campaigns. In every district there are 20 or 30 men back home that would like to have your job. They would run against you if they thought they

had a chance to win. The only reason they do not run is because they do not think they have a chance to win. There is no better way to encourage them than to keep on throwing money around to the departments—letting the departments write their own tickets. And then grinding the taxpayers down to get the money to pay the bills.

We have only a few more bills and a few more weeks to wait to find out whether we have cut enough from the budget to support a tax bill. Unless we do there is no chance for tax relief now or next year or any other year.

The amount generally indicated by the experts who pass on the matter, is \$4 billion. They estimate, say we will have to cut \$4 billion out of this budget to justify a tax cut. In round figures the budget by the end of the session will aggregate \$72 billion, and we will have to cut it down to at least \$68 billion to warrant a tax cut. Up to this time we have cut nearly one and one-quarter billion dollars, and we have done it by piecemeal. Every time we have brought in an amendment to cut a little off an appropriation there has been a storm of protest saying that is peanuts, it is chicken-feed, what is the use of cutting small amounts like that? But many a mickle makes a muckle—we have now cut about \$1.25 billion. But we must have \$2.75 billion more.

And we will have to quit bringing in these deficiency bills. What is the use of cutting a little money here and there and then bringing in a deficiency bill like this, and throwing it all out the back door? In the bill before you, you are undoing part of what you accomplished when you made these piecemeal cuts which gave you this start of \$1.25 billion on our slow but sure way to tax reduction.

The stock market has been on a steady downward trend. Eight to ten percent of industrial securities on the exchange have lost a total of \$18 billion in the last 18 months. So the outlook for continued increased income, increased prosperity, is not so good. We run in cycles. These money trees do not bloom forever. We are on the downward swing of the cycle. We cannot depend on recordbreaking revenues indefinitely.

And the burden of taxation is rapidly reaching the maximum of human endurance.

The purchasing power of the average factory worker is lower than it was a year earlier. It is significant that this is the first time that has happened during the Eisenhower administration.

Taxes—State, Federal, and local taxes—take about 1 dollar out of every 3 the average man makes.

A man today in standard industry is really working 2 hours and 45 minutes out of every 8-hour day for the Government. Out of every 8-hour day he has to work 2 hours and 45 minutes to pay his taxes before he begins to make anything to support his family. That leaves about 5 hours and 15 minutes a day to provide food, housing, clothing, and everything else the family requires. In other words, over one-third of every day we are working for the Government. High taxes intensify inflation, hike the

cost of living higher, and cut the buying power of the pay of the daily wage worker lower.

We have some chance to say what shall be spent locally for schools in our town, county, and community centers, but nationally we have let control of expenditure get away from us as in this bill.

Britain is in dire distress—yet they are reducing taxes.

Our situation, our responsibility, in the world is growing. Britain and France and other NATO countries are pulling out; they are withdrawing; they are taking their troops home; they are throwing the burden on us. We will need financial stability and solvency, as never before. How shall we maintain it when every year this budget swells, until this year we have the largest peacetime budget in history?

Too much cannot be said for the faithful, efficient, hard-working personnel of the Post Office Department. All through the country in every post office you find men ready and able and willing, doing their work, filling their jobs, and carrying on. But they need leadership. Where there is no leadership, the people perish.

And there is another phrase in that quotation that is apropos at this time. "But he that keepeth the law, happy is he."

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General will read that famous, that wonderful statement justified by the centuries from the pen of the wisest of all men, King Solomon. It was true in his day, it is true in our day.

The Post Office Department is one of the biggest businesses in the world. It is a monopoly. It controls the market completely. No competitor can interfere. Yet this enormous business with an absolute monopoly cannot keep its ledgers in the black. They need business efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, here is an editorial from this morning's Wall Street Journal.

The Wall Street Journal is perhaps the widest read financial journal in the world. It supported President Eisenhower in 1952 and in 1956. It heartily approved Br. Brundage as Director of the Budget, and it was in complete agreement with the appointment of Mr. Summerfield as Postmaster General. So I have seldom found myself in agreement with its editorial policies. But this morning its leading editorial indicates one of the most profound reversals in the history of American journalism.

Also, in this connection I include a telegram just handed to me as I came in. It is from an organization of businessmen in Baltimore:

BALTIMORE, Md., April 15, 1957.

All right, so the post office did not operate Saturday. But nobody was seriously hurt. Now let's stick to our guns and see that Postmaster General Summerfield operates the Department within the budget. Economy must be enforced.

And here is what the Wall Street Journal had to say:

So, Postmaster General Summerfield has informed Congress that if it does not

promptly give him the money he wants for the Post Office, he will take a meat ax to the postal servlee.

Now, you know, that term "meat ax" strikes a responsive cord in memeroy. We have heard that word "Meat ax" before. The meat ax is going to cut appropriations; going to insist on economy; going to enforce the Antideficiency Act. My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] over there, known as the great meat ax expert, comes in today like Mary's little lamb, following behind the Postmaster General. No meat ax at all. Just an affectionate little sheep. And, may I add that when he was chairman of the committee and we had before us a Postmaster General who had not spent money but merely proposed spending money, that I supported him and supported the committee against my own Postmaster General. There was no politics in it then. We have something more important than politics in this. I voted with the gentleman from New York. I supported him. I supported my chairman in his criticism of my Postmaster General, in his insistence that the Postmaster General should obey the antideficiency law. But, when the shoe is on the other foot, that is a different matter, and no matter how much money they waste he is entirely satisfied with the way things are going down there in the Post Office Department when nobody else is satisfied.

But here is the editorial. It is from New York, too:

The "general's" ultimatum was handed to the Congressmen a week ago, and when they didn't fall all over themselves in a rush to put up the money, he got out the cleaver. In New York and many other cities the post office windows were shuttered on Saturday and there were no mail deliveries. Further cutbacks in service are scheduled for this morning. The general's operation plan calls for cutting daily mail deliveries to business today. If that doesn't speed up Congress, he will suspend money-order sales at first and second-class post offices on April 29.

And that is another thing which a great many telegrams mentioned this morning, that they do not need any Federal money orders; the banks can operate quicker and cheaper.

Now none of this, you understand, has anything to do with the regular Post Office appropriation.

And that is something we should not lose sight of.

Congress appropriated the 1957 money last year; the 1958 appropriation is not due until next June 30. This is extra money—known technically as a deficiency appropriation—that Mr. Summerfield is asking to tide him over until next June 30.

And he says, "Gimme quick, or else."

And you can supply the remainder.

If this strikes you as pretty arrogant behavior from a public servant—a sort of blackmail of the body politic—Mr. Summerfield's defense is that he can't help it. He has just plain run out of money. And how can he be expected to run the Post Office, or anything else, without money?

The trouble with this reply is that it raises as many questions as it answers.

It is certainly not amiss to inquire why this emergency came so suddenly. Mr. Summerfield knew last summer how much money he had to run the Post Office for a full 12

months. Dividing a given sum of money by 12 doesn't require advanced mathematics. If it is true, as alleged, that the money provided last summer was too penurious to keep service up to par for the full year, one still wonders why small adjustments were not made during the year.

It might be said, also, that one still wonders why he did not come to Congress about it—why the President himself did not see fit to send up a supplemental budget. Mr. Summerfield works under the direction of the President.

No sensible post-office clerk, however unhappily underpaid, would unconcernedly spend his year's salary in less than a year.

The difference may well be that a post-office clerk is not habituated to deficiency appropriations. With Government departments they were, at one time, so usual as to seem an almost unquestioned right—

That is why we have that antideficiency law. That is why we put teeth in it in 1950—

and Mr. Summerfield may be honestly surprised to find himself now out of money and none promptly provided. It's a temptation to forego frugality in November when the Appropriations Committees will be in session in April.

To suppose that this sudden crisis was deliberately developed for its dramatic effect on Congress may be very unfair. It could be that the Post Office Department was simply lulled into not counting its pennies carefully. But if this is not a calculated kind of political blackmail—

The staid and conservative Wall Street Journal says this—

But if this is not a calculated kind of political blackmail, then somebody in Congress ought to find out who goofed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has reported a bill, H. R. 6870 by Mr. CANNON from the House Committee on Appropriations. Is he asking the House to support this proposed legislation or is he asking the House to vote against it?

Mr. CANNON. I am asking the House to take into consideration the facts. They are before us here. You should govern yourself accordingly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But does the gentleman want us to vote against the whole thing?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may do as he pleases. I will not vote for it. I will not vote to abdicate the right of the Congress to control national finances. I will not condone violation of law. I will not vote to increase expenses and make it impossible to lower taxes. I will not vote to discard the antideficiency law after JOHN TABER and I and more than a hundred members of the Committee on Appropriations have worked for years to perfect it to the point where it will protect the United States Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I remember so well one of the great perorations of the gentleman from Missouri,

the distinguished Chairman of our Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] about 1 year ago. We were then discussing the appropriation bill having to do with funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARRY] had proposed an amendment having to do with the National Institutes of Health, raising the figure requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman of Missouri came into the well of the House and he indulged in this peroration at the close of his speech.

"Why," he said, "Mr. Chairman, I cannot be for cancer. I have got to be for free beer. I must support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island."

And he did, upping the figure requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

I am not high enough up in this world to be a regular subscriber for the Wall Street Journal, but I believe and I believe most sincerely that the House today will discharge its responsibility to the postal patrons of the United States and to the postal workers of our country. And I cannot help but believe that the Congress as a whole will send this bill to the President not later than tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times has rendered a real service in reporting today a survey of postal services in foreign countries—on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It contends that such services are generally far superior to ours and usually pay their own way.

Slight losses in the British postal system last year were offset by profits on its telephone and telegraph services and currently up to four deliveries are made daily in London on business days and all urban areas get two deliveries a day.

France has also a splendid record and raises its rates when necessary to balance the postal budget. Paris has 4 deliveries a day, 6 days a week.

In West Germany, the postal system operates at a profit and there are two deliveries a day, Monday through Saturday.

Italy generally breaks about even and the larger cities have 3 deliveries 6 days a week, villages having 2.

Spain also reports a profit in its postal system, its larger cities having from 2 to 4 deliveries on workdays plus 1 on Sundays and holidays. Its system operates at a profit.

Seven-day-a-week deliveries are also the rule in Japan and in the large cities there are three deliveries on weekdays. Japan's postal system has run at a profit for the last 5 years because of expanded business and postage rises.

In Moscow, the Russians get four deliveries every day of the week. A first-class letter costs 10 cents and an air-mail letter 25 cents in our money.

Motor scooters help expedite Pakistan's deliveries every day except Sunday.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman if he would be in favor of paying the postal employees the same amount that is being paid the postal employees in those countries? If we were to do that in America, I am absolutely certain we would make a profit on our postal service, but I am not in favor of eliminating the deficit in that manner.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to my friend from Virginia that the domestic letter rate today in Germany is 4.8 cents, in France it is 4.3 cents, in Belgium it is 4 cents, in Norway it is 4.2 cents, in Switzerland it is 4.6 cents, and in Sweden it is 4.6 cents. The average is 4.4 cents, while we still use the 3-cent letter rate.

I do not have to repeat to you now the platforms adopted by the Republican and Democratic Parties last summer. Both of them stressed more expeditious and more efficient employment of our mail services. If anything, the Democratic platform was stronger than the Republican platform, because the Democratic platform emphasized more frequent delivery of our mail.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the 1952 platform of the Republican Party, which specifically promised the return of the two deliveries a day?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not recall that, but may I say to my friend from Massachusetts that I am still for the two deliveries a day. As the gentleman knows, our committee voted preponderantly to do away with that several years ago, and it has been done away with. I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is of course in a much better position to make the statement he has made than a lot of his colleagues on his side, because the gentleman is very independent minded.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. When did we do away with two deliveries a day, under what Postmaster General?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe they were done away with in the year 1950. The abolition of the two-a-day system was projected by our subcommittee and that suggestion was promptly accommodated by the then Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson. I strongly dissented.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the then Postmaster General told the committee if he did not get certain moneys he would eliminate one of the deliveries a day, and that followed?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. No, he did not tell the committee that. The committee cut his request \$47 million and suggested that one way he could make up the \$47 million was by eliminating 1 mail delivery a day in residential sections. He did so and saved \$100 million a year. The pres-

ent Postmaster General estimates that to reinstate that one delivery daily would cost \$150 million a year, and I, for one, do not think it is worth it.

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe the gentleman from Virginia will recall that the facts are these. The Department was cut some \$26 million by the committee and \$22 million by the Bureau of the Budget and following the suggestion of our subcommittee, he issued the order doing away with the 2 deliveries a day.

Mr. GARY. I meant that his estimate was cut \$47 million.

Mr. CANFIELD. I recognize that.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department of the United States loses money on practically every piece of mail it delivers excepting, that is, packages, and it is required to operate on 1957 costs with 1932 rates. It is important to bear in mind the Department spends most of the money it gets for personnel. Seventy-seven cents of every dollar goes to its employees and 16 cents for transportation and the other 7 cents for other expenses such as rent and so on.

It is clear, therefore, that most of the Department's expenses are completely out of its control.

Since 1945, the last surplus year, the Department reports its increases in wages, transportation, supplies, and other costs have amounted to \$1,860,000,000. About \$1,300,000,000 of this is attributed to wage and fringe benefit legislation approved by the Congress itself. During this period, Congress raised postal rates on two occasions to provide less than \$275 million in additional revenue. The demands for new service have bolstered the deficit, which nevertheless is expected next year to at least remain below the peak low of \$720 million set in 1952.

Mr. Chairman, the relationship between the Post Office Department and the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House have been extremely harmonious over the years. The record of the hearings contained repeated statements by committee members—by our chairman—by all committee members irrespective of party—complimenting the Postmaster General and the members of his staff for their accomplishments in modernizing the postal establishment and improving the mail service.

Frankly, I cannot help but resent the statements made today by the distinguished chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], inferring that the Postmaster General believes in and indulges in a public-be-damned philosophy. You can read the hearings. Every page of the hearings conducted by our subcommittee these last 4 years—and until March 26, 1957, you will not be able to find one word derogatory of the character, the approach, and the dedication of the Postmaster General of our United States. We have gotten along with him very well indeed.

The Senate committee handling the Post Office request for supplemental funds knew last July that the Bureau of the Budget would come before the Con-

gress requesting a supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department sometime later in the year. It was suggested on the other side of Capitol Hill that the Post Office Department wait until this year, the last half of the fiscal year 1957, to press for this supplemental.

On January 15 of this year, in a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office appropriations, the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] asked the direct question as to the amount of the supplemental appropriation which the Department needed for the balance of the year. He was told this would total \$53 million, which included \$6 million for capital improvements. The Bureau of the Budget agreed to delete \$6 million for capital improvements on three of the largest post offices in our country, those in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. And now those funds are needed today to modernize those offices. Those offices have to do with the gateway cities of our country, servicing some 27 percent of our mail. It is extremely unfortunate that the Post Office Department was forced into this straitjacket situation, for it cannot spend money until it is actually in hand. The losers in a difficult situation, such as we are now experiencing, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, besides the postal patrons of our country are 520,000 faithful postal workers. The Congress should, I am certain, take positive action to appropriate the funds needed to resume normal mail service until June 30.

The Congress furthermore faces a similar situation which should be resolved promptly as regards the funds needed by the Post Office Department for its operations during the 1958 fiscal year starting on July 1. The Department has already indicated they will need \$58 million more to continue normal mail service throughout the fiscal year 1958 than so far has been appropriated to it. If the Congress fails to grant these additional moneys, the Post Office Department once again will have to curtail the mail service to live within its budgetary appropriation. In a few months are we going over this same situation again?

The continual phenomenal growth of our country and the unprecedented prosperity of our economy are basic reasons why the Post Office Department needs more money to carry an increased volume of mail than it originally estimated 18 months ago.

No business in the world can increase its volume without increasing costs, and the Post Office Department is no exception to the rule. When the people of the country decide to send more mail than the Department estimates, the Department must deliver it. Under these circumstances commonsense indicates the Department should have a more flexible procedure than at present, to get the money for these inevitable added costs. This is particularly true since by law all receipts of the Post Office De-

partment go directly to the Treasury Department.

In the fiscal year 1958 the Department estimates it will have to extend letter-carrier service to 5,000 new communities. Unless it has the money to do so, and a large part of the \$58 million additional it needs will go for this purpose, our postal system will go backward rather than forward. Certainly the Members of Congress should understand these facts and be prepared to appropriate the funds needed to give the American people the mail service they deserve, expect, and are willing to pay for.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department must prepare its budget about 12 months ahead of the beginning of the fiscal year. Work is really begun 18 months ahead. Hearings are held about 6 months before the start of the fiscal year. In preparing these budgets all expenditure estimates have to be related to the estimated volume of mail to be carried. The final appropriation limits the amount to be spent and has no provision for change in spending authority as the conditions change.

If the country is prosperous and people send more mail and are building more homes and start more new businesses than the Department has estimated, the postal service nevertheless has no more money to spend. Any increase in its receipts goes to the Treasury.

On the other hand, if conditions should turn downward and mails should decrease and other factors turn out to be less than the Department estimated, Congress holds no strings to reduce the Department's spending power.

This clearly points up the need for a new look by Congress at the post office budget problem, with some changes in the law or the annual appropriation procedure. One way would be for each appropriation to provide flexibility by giving the Postmaster General the authority to spend an additional amount equal to the amount by which receipts for the year exceed the estimates. This provision could be policed by the Bureau of the Budget, with reports to the Congress from time to time.

Another way to do it is to put the post office on a true revolving fund basis. Under such a plan the Congress would appropriate only for the net deficit—which we would hope, with higher postage rates, would be very small. If the Postmaster General then had authority to spend all of his receipts, in addition to the appropriated deficit, the amount that he could spend would automatically adjust upward or downward as the receipts went upward or downward.

It is unfair to put the postal administration in the position which it has had to face this year. It would be even more unfair to perpetuate this unworkable situation for the future. Congress should act this year to determine the proper way to provide flexibility in post office budgets, so that postal services would not have to be curtailed to live within estimates made more than 12 months ahead of the beginning of the year.

Now I want to say a word about postal employment.

The highest fiscal year and figure for postal employment was 1952. On June 30 in that year the number of postal employees was 523,757.

On June 30, 1957, postal employment will be just about the same figure.

In the same time the volume of mail has increased by 18 percent, establishing the efficiency of our postal workers.

Now, supplemental appropriations are not a new thing in the Congress of the United States. In 1947 the Post Office Department received a supplemental appropriation from the Congress for operating funds of \$93 million. In 1948 it received \$173,700,000; 1949, \$140,800,000; in 1950, \$71,400,000; in 1951 \$29,400,000; in 1951 it received \$250,000.

In 1953 the Department returned to the Treasury of the United States as surplus \$83,574,247. In 1954 the same Department returned to the Treasury \$109 million, in round figures, and in 1955, the same Department returned to the Treasury \$43 million.

In 1956 the Congress voted a supplemental appropriation of \$16 million plus \$150 million for the salaries of postal workers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that first of all perhaps I ought to give you my own position. I have not changed in the slightest degree my feelings on the antideficiency law.

The difference between me and my position and the gentleman from Missouri and his position is that I maintain it is the duty of the Congress to supply the funds that are necessary to operate the agencies of the Government, and that we cannot punish the patrons of the postal system and the employees of the Post Office Department by trying to get even with them for something they did not themselves do. That is the reason I am wholeheartedly supporting this appropriation for the Post Office Department.

This deficiency—and it is a deficiency—is the result of the enormous increase in the number of dwellings and dwelling units that have been completed in this country, running between 1 million and 1.6 million a year over the post-war years. That has resulted in the necessity of creating new carrier routes and in some places additional clerks to take care of the office work in these places. There has also been more or less a buildup because of the change in the method of living.

As to whether or not this item is needed, I call your attention just now to the situation with which we are confronted. In the third quarter of this fiscal year the expenditures were \$484,612,000. The amount left over from the year's appropriations is \$443,884,000, or practically \$444 million. There will be a couple more days in the last quarter down to the 30th of June than there were in previous quarters.

On top of that the Post Office Department will have to finance certain amounts of annual leave for post office

employees. It has been the invariable custom of the Post Office establishment to take care of a certain percentage of those annual leaves in the fourth quarter of the year, that is, in the spring and early summer. More of it comes in the following period, which runs from the 1st of July to close to the 1st of October. That is the situation.

There have been certain transfers in the Department from the transportation fund to the operational fund and they have to a certain extent reduced the amount of the deficiency.

As to what the situation is with reference to the antideficiency law, the Comptroller General has made a decision. He has written a letter dated the 12th of April, addressed to the Postmaster General. I have a copy of that letter. I would think that it would be desirable for the membership to read that. Frankly, I believe that the Postmaster General should operate his plant so as to come within his appropriations. If he cannot, he should come back to the Congress early for a deficiency. He actually did advise the Congress back in the early part of January that he was going to have a deficiency for this year, and the figure he gave at that time was \$53 million, which I understand is \$6 million above the amount of the budget estimate that was considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but it was that way because that \$6 million was for transportation and it was determined that they did not need that deficiency.

Now, it is clear from the Comptroller General's opinion that there was no violation of the antideficiency law which is punishable in any way under the law. Perhaps the law requires revision, but this is the situation that we are actually confronted with, and this is the situation that we must face as we come to pass upon this bill. In other words, we should provide for what are the needs of the Department to give the kind of service that the people of the United States feel should be provided to the public, and pay for the services of the employees of the Post Office Department, and I think we should do this with just as little inconvenience in the operation of the situation as it is possible to have.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the gentleman—and I am stating this for summary emphasis—making the argument that at this time and under the consideration of this measure the point is not how the deficiency occurred, but the point is who is going to be hurt if we do not pass this additional appropriation, namely, that it is going to be the users of the mail and the patrons of the mail that will be punished rather than any individual that might or might not have caused the trouble.

Mr. TABER. That is exactly correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that there will be a very great

loss to the business of the country of this service is not continued; that in dollars and cents the Government will lose a great deal of money? Is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how much, but I know it will create a good many bad situations. For instance, I think we are going to begin to hear from our farmer friends on rural free delivery routes who will not get their Saturday morning papers if this situation is not corrected. And I do not see how the Postmaster General can proceed, with the charges that have been bandied about, to open up the services that have been curtailed until he receives the money to do it with. If we are going to have respect for the things that the committee has complained about, I do not see how that can be had unless that course is followed. Now, that is my position. That is how I feel.

There is no question in my mind but what the items of service that are involved here are, practically all of them, things that should be given to the public. There might be some way to discontinue some work. But most of the things we would discontinue to bring about a reduction in operating expenses that would be required to bring the Post Office Department within the amount of money, \$443 million that is available for the quarter, are things that you cannot very satisfactorily explain to the people.

I am in hopes that this Congress will today go through the bill and pass it, so that it may go over to the other body and so that the other body may act on it, and so that it will remain as it has been presented to the members of the Committee of the Whole here rather than with any amendments that might delay its final passage. The bill relates only to a few deficiency items. It is not a long bill. I do not believe there is anything in it that would need to be changed very substantially.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman would enlighten the House on a matter of procedure? It is my understanding that much of the criticism directed against the Postmaster General has been to the point that he borrowed in one quarter against a succeeding quarter; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I think there is criticism of him for that. Of course, he did not violate the law himself. If the law was violated, according to the Comptroller General, it was violated by the Budget.

Mr. JOHANSEN. My question goes to this point. If the Postmaster General determines in the middle of a given quarter that the funds allocated for that quarter are not going to be adequate, what is the proper procedure for the Postmaster General in order to meet all possible criticism from whatever source and of whatever character to avoid borrowing against a future quarter?

Mr. TABER. I never heard of anybody who did anything who did not get some criticism. My own opinion is that the Postmaster General, in his approach to the problem, has been very careful to do the things that were proper and to

keep within balance on his appropriations, to make the funds go far enough to take care of the job of giving service to the public. I will say this, and I know this is so, because it was pretty well covered in the hearings; he is up against this kind of a situation, with tremendous pressure all the time for new service. I ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] to correct me if I am not right, but it is going to be necessary to provide 6,000 or 7,000 new clerks and carriers to carry on the load and give the service that the people require in 1957. The gentleman indicates that that is correct. That is the situation we are faced with. If we are not prepared to provide service, we are not in too good a position to raise the rates.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. My original question was directed to the point of how the Postmaster General, with the pressures for increased services and with the problem of budgeting 12 to 18 months ahead of time, is going to avoid this sort of situation again, and not lay himself open again to what I think has been an unfair castigation to which he has been subjected.

Mr. TABER. That is evidence that the Postmaster General has done something and kept things moving.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not correct that nearly all of the funds requested in this deficiency appropriation come about because of the extension and expansion of the Post Office Department, and that comes from the public itself demanding these additional services?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it results from the change in the mode of living of the people, the number of people we have, and the growing of age of that group of youngsters who were born right after the war.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman agree with me that whatever may have been said with regard to the management of the Department, and personally I think that it has been managed well, we ought not to punish the people who work in the Post Office Department because of the need for funds? These funds go to the people who work in the Post Office Department, the carriers, the clerks, the people who work in the service down there. Is there any good reason the gentleman can see why we should not go ahead and allow these funds to pay them?

Mr. TABER. I can see no good reason, and I also feel that the patrons of the Post Office Department are entitled to service. We ought to provide it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have no right to punish them.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been so fully discussed in the last

few weeks that it is not my intention to prolong the discussion at this time, but I do think there are certain facts this body should know when it votes on the proposal before it.

Last year the Postmaster General submitted his budget estimates for the fiscal year 1957 and he requested \$3 billion to run the Post Office Department. I have heard the statement made on this floor many times that there is not a budget of a single department of this Government that you could not cut 10 percent without hurting the department.

Our committee studied these estimates very carefully. We held hearings for weeks. We did not cut him 10 percent, we did not cut him 5 percent. The Congress did not cut him even 1 percent. We cut him \$15,660,000, which was one-half of 1 percent. It seems to me the Postmaster General could have absorbed a cut as small as that had he so desired.

That appropriation of \$3 billion is divided into five separate items—administration, research, operations, transportation, finance and facilities. He is asking now only for the appropriation of additional funds for operations. Let us see what the situation is as to operations. He requested \$2,118,880,000 for operations. We cut that request only \$5,440,000. Under the law, we have allowed the Post Office Department transfer authority that is not enjoyed by any of the other departments of Government so far as I know except the military. But, the Congress permits them to transfer up to 5 percent from one item to another. They transferred from other items to operations a net of \$11,290,000 which gave them \$5,850,000 more than they requested for the operations of the Post Office Department.

It is true, as the gentleman from New Jersey said, that when they presented their full request to the committee for the fiscal year 1958, they told us at that time they were going to ask for \$53 million in supplemental funds, but at the same time that the Postmaster General told us he was going to ask for these funds, the Budget Director told us that he had not decided to allow them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the Bureau of the Budget last July agreed on \$30 million?

Mr. GARY. Last July?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, indeed; last July.

Mr. GARY. No, sir; not according to my knowledge.

Mr. CANFIELD. That was sent to the other body. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and sent to the other body.

Mr. GARY. It did not come to the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. GARY. The only information that we had came from a conversation that the clerk of our committee had with the Director of the Budget in January or February of this year. He told our clerk that he had not decided to allow anything. He said that last year the Post Office Department had asked for \$53

million; that he had gotten them down to \$20 million, and he did not know whether he would allow them anything. Let me say to the gentleman that the first request sent to the Congress for additional funds came on March 12.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sorry to disagree with my friend, but I must point out that the first request was sent to the other body and the subcommittee on appropriations of the other body received that request on July 12, 1956, in the amount of \$30 million and the Post Office Department was then told, "Hold off until next year and then we will do business with you."

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that appropriations under the Constitution originate in the House. I do not know what was sent to the other body, but certainly any request, since this body has the authority to originate appropriations, should be sent to the House of Representatives. As I was saying, the first request that we received was on March 12 of this year. Before submitting that request, the Postmaster General came to my office and told me he needed additional funds and he needed them promptly. I promised him if he would submit his request, he would have an immediate hearing. Just as soon as that request reached our committee I tried to set the hearings for Tuesday of the following week. The Postmaster General himself requested a postponement of those hearings because, he stated, he had already made engagements to appear before the legislative committee to testify on rates during the week and, consequently, the hearings were postponed for 1 week at his request. The next week we heard his request, and as we listened to him, we found out that the antideficiency law had been violated. If anyone questions whether or not that law has been violated, let him look at page 171 of the hearings of our subcommittee. There you will find a very complete table of the apportionments for the year.

The antideficiency law requires that these apportionments be made so that there will not be a deficiency at the end of the year. The initial apportionments were made on that basis, but you will find they were revised on July 10, 1956; they were revised again on July 13, 1956. That is, there were slight changes in the apportionments but very slight. They were revised again on August 30 and on October 4, 1956. Then on December 14, 1956, is the time that they began to take the money from the third and fourth quarter funds and use them in the second quarter. When they came to the revision of February 4, 1957, they transferred large sums of money from the fourth quarter to the second and third quarters. According to their own testimony, they knew long before February 4 that there was going to be deficit and, yet, they knew that these transfers were being made—they with that knowledge they deliberately transferred funds from the fourth quarter to the second and third quarters instead of coming to the Congress and asking for additional appropriations.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Who made these quarterly apportionments? The Postmaster General or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. GARY. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget made the apportionments at the request of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY. The Postmaster General has no authority to make those apportionments.

Mr. GARY. But he does have the power to request them.

Mr. MURRAY. Who made the apportionments back to the second and third quarters or the first quarter?

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of the Budget, at the request of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY. If anyone is to blame, it is the Bureau of the Budget and not the Postmaster General.

Mr. GARY. Well, I am sure the Bureau of the Budget would not have made the change in the apportionments if it had not been requested by the Postmaster General. I am not trying to fix blame. I am trying to give this body the facts in this case.

Mr. MURRAY. There has been some criticism of the Postmaster General, because he did not come before Congress last fall. The Congress was not in session, and he had no opportunity to come before the Congress before this January. Is that not correct?

Mr. GARY. He said he knew he was going to have a deficiency in July, and the Congress did not adjourn until August. In that connection, I may add that I have just been reliably informed that no request was made to the Senate for additional funds last July. The Post Office Department requested the Budget Bureau to approve additional funds, but the request was refused.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Inasmuch as the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General are both Republicans, why not apportion the blame instead of putting it all on the Postmaster General?

Mr. GARY. I am not trying to put the blame on anybody. I have simply stated the facts. I have said that the law was violated, and the General Accounting Office has also said that the law has been violated. I insert the report of the House Appropriations Committee at this point to substantiate my position:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

The committee considered an estimate of \$47 million contained in House Document No. 115, and recommends an appropriation of \$41 million. Approval of this action by Congress will result in there being available for operations in 1957 a total of \$2,165,730,000, which includes the result of the exercise of transfer authority by the Department, and is \$46,850,000 more than the original estimate for 1957, and \$51,290,000 more than the appropriation made by the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1957.

In spite of the increases in availability of funds by transfers, the Department has been operating at a rate of obligation which, the witness threatened, would require the cessation of postal service "completely for 2 weeks" in the event the request were denied.

The committee reviewed with the Department and with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the details of the apportionment requests of the Department and the subsequent approvals by the Bureau. This review coupled with an analysis of the obligations incurred, established the fact that all operations have been geared to an inevitable deficiency. It seems abundantly clear that the Department made no effort to operate within even the augmented appropriation, and that the apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget openly gave Executive approval to this course of action, contrary to law. It must be pointed out that the very same Director of the Budget who approved the various reapportionment requests leading directly to this deficiency at the same time "specifically said I would not send up a supplemental for those amounts."

Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended in 1950, was designed to preclude the situation which now arises. In discussing the law on the floor of the House on May 10, 1950, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] said of paragraph 1 of subsection c:

"This is designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made, and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

The Postmaster General requested the General Accounting Office to issue an opinion as to whether or not the law had been complied with. Today, a letter (B-131361) from the Comptroller General states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47 million, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957, before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the services of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

"If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for 'Operations' or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, title 31 United States Code, section 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (1) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

"The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Anti-Deficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act."

Although the items involved in the request all result from actions contrary to the law, a majority of the committee feel that the necessity for maintaining service to the public is an overriding consideration. Of the amount requested, approximately \$2 million meets the test of paragraph 1 of subsection (e) as an exception to the prohibition of deficiency apportioning, the balance does not. The committee recognizes that certain mitigating circumstances surround an additional \$17 million of the estimate in that the effective date of the reclassification portion of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, although technically prior to the transmission of the estimates was, in fact, subsequent to the preparation of the estimates for printing and transmission.

The administrative decisions necessary during the interim pending approval of this appropriation have been and will continue to be unfortunate. Had these decisions been made nearly a year ago, when they should have been, the present situation would not have arisen. It is most regrettable that a service so vital to the economy of our Nation, and affecting personally and individually each of our people, has thus been so callously jeopardized by the injudicious action of the executive branch which now seeks to escape justifiable criticism by overtly threatening the Congress.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman says the law has been violated. Apparently there is no penalty for a violation of that law. Does the gentleman agree with me that we could determine responsibility very quickly by just passing a simple resolution introduced in this body to bring somebody to account for the expenditures and the violation of this law?

Mr. GARY. I think the Congress could fix the blame if it desired. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Is it not a fact that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at least turned down the request of the Postmaster General for supplemental funds? Is it not also the fact that when the supplemental request for the various agencies was sent up, it was the chairman who notified the Postmaster General that his item was not contained in a list specifically designated as emergency items?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The request was sent up on March 12. When we held our hearings the Postmaster General insisted he had to have this money immediately. The chairman of the committee called his attention to the fact that this item had been sent to us with numerous other items, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had been requested to mark the items that were urgent, and that the Post Office appropriation was not included in the list of urgent matters. The Director of the Budget did subsequently write a letter to the committee designating the item as urgent. The letter arrived on April 3.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Knowing of the complete fairness of the gentleman from Virginia, I am asking this question with reference to the future rather than the past, and I am directing a very similar

question to the gentleman from Virginia that I directed to the gentleman from New York. I would like to know first of all if there is a certain latitude within which the Director of the Budget may approve transfers from one quarter to an earlier quarter.

Mr. GARY. Not if they will bring about a deficiency; but here is the idea: Whenever the head of a department finds he is going to have a deficiency, that he needs more money, then he should come before the Congress before that deficiency is incurred so that the Congress will have the right to pass upon the question as to whether or not he should have the additional funds.

We did not have that cooperation in this instance, but to the contrary, the Postmaster General came before our committee after the funds had been overspent in the first three quarters and said: "You give us this additional money or else!"

He said we had but two alternatives; one, to cut off the main service entirely on June 15 for the rest of the month, or else begin to curtail service immediately if we were not going to allow the funds.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: In a subsequent year, if in any quarter prior to the fourth it is found that the funds allocated to that quarter are not adequate, do I understand that the Postmaster General may with the approval of the Director of the Budget Bureau use funds for a later quarter, provided the borrowing does not create a deficit for the entire year?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then if it is determined that it would create a deficit, the Postmaster General is supposed to come to the Congress before the borrowing is done.

Mr. GARY. Exactly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am interested in how it works.

Mr. GARY. In the present instance the Postmaster General admits that he knew there was going to be a deficit when the transfers were made, yet no request was made to the Congress.

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is a debatable point but I am asking the gentleman as to procedure.

Mr. GARY. There is no debate as to what the Postmaster General said before our committee. He testified that he knew there would be this deficiency.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. The justification that was contained in the message from the President on the deficiency bill known as House Document 115 gave certain reasons why they needed this \$47 million. When the Post Office Department representatives appeared before our committee, some admission was made as to the fact that the justifications contained in the President's message were not accurate, and they gave some other reasons at that time why they needed the \$47 million. Will the gentleman explain to the House this discrepancy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(Mr. CANNON yielded 5 additional minutes to Mr. GARY).

Mr. GARY. There were two items. One item clearly came within the provisions of the antideficiency law. The Congress after the original requests had been submitted passed a law authorizing the Post Office Department to pay the postal employees while they are engaged in military service in the Reserves. That cost \$2 million.

In addition, there was another item that they admitted did not come specifically within the exception in the law. The Congress prior to the time they submitted their budget request passed a law increasing postal salaries. They had taken that law into consideration, but there was a provision in that law requiring the reclassification of postal employees, and that provision did not become effective until the following December.

The Post Office Department representatives testified that when they put that provision into effect they found it cost more than they had anticipated by \$17 million. Our committee, although realizing it was a technical violation of the law, did not want to be technical and recommended the \$17 million. Frankly I think we should also have recommended the \$2 million which was overlooked.

Mr. TABOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Postmaster General went to the Budget Bureau on the 10th of July last year and the Bureau called the Senate committee which said that it was too late in the session for the submission of a supplemental request. After that, on his next possible appearance before the Congress, on the 15th of January, he told the subcommittee he was going to have a deficit of \$53 million and after that he followed the thing up with the budget to get a budget estimate. What does the gentleman think the Postmaster General should have done? Should he have immediately on the 1st of July or the 1st of August, when he found out he did not get the first budget estimate, curtailed the operation of the post office at a time when it was impossible for the Congress to do anything or should he have done what he did? I would like to have the gentleman clarify that.

Mr. GARY. I will say that was a question for the administration to handle. When two of his administrative departments disagree the decision as to which is right rests with the President. I have not attempted to fix the responsibility. I have said that the law has been violated. The General Accounting Office has sustained that position. I am not going to quibble with the gentleman as to which department violated the law. If this had been handled properly there would not have been any question about adequate funds being supplied. The fault is certainly not with the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are wondering, regardless of who may or may not be to blame, whether or not this appropriation of \$41 million is sufficient to restore to the country an adequate mail service on the same basis that we have had up to June 30?

Mr. GARY. That is another question for the Postmaster General to answer. He said that he could not get by with a penny less than \$47 million.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. GARY. I do not know. We only cut his appropriation one-half of 1 percent. We thought he could have absorbed that without difficulty, but he has not absorbed any of it. He is asking for more money than he requested originally. If we give him the \$17 million that our subcommittee recommends he will have \$1,340,000 more than he requested originally.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; but perhaps the amount granted in this bill is not enough. How did the gentleman's committee get at that figure?

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that I am against the \$41 million. I am for the \$19 million. I want him to live within the amount that the Congress appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the question before us boils down to this: Is the Congress of the United States going to control the expenditures of this Government or are we going to turn it over to bureaucrats? That is the whole question. The Hoover Commission has recommended that the Congress be given greater control over governmental expenditures. I think that is proper, because the Members of Congress are elected by the people and they represent the people.

The most effective control that we have today is the control that is set forth in this antideficiency law. Once we relinquish that control, once we capitulate to the threats and tactics of the Postmaster General, then we have relinquished our most effective control. To me, that is of far greater consequence than the temporary inconvenience of the mail users.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams and messages on this situation. Somebody said that when we hear from the rural people we will change our minds. Let me read you a telegram I received from a rural delivery carrier in one of the Western States:

Congratulations on your subcommittee recommendations for the Post Office Department. Patrons contacted today are not interested in Saturday service, did not care if rates went up where post office could pay own way, wondered why they got so much junk mail. I serve 320 families, 64-mile route, 10 years service.

I have heard a lot of talk about the mail service of foreign countries here today. The first speech that I made on the floor of this House was in favor of a salary increase for postal employees. It was in 1945 and at that time they had

not had a salary increase for 20 years. I think we have got to pay our postal employees salaries commensurate with the salaries paid by private industries. I am for giving them good salaries, but whenever we talk of what the foreign services are doing, if you will just compare our pay of postal employees with theirs, you will see that there is a great difference. In addition to that, we have not increased our postal rates on first- and second-class mail since 1932. I am for an increase in the postal rates to make each class of mail pay its own way. Let me say that I appeared before Mr. MURRAY's committee last week and testified for three-quarters of an hour on that subject. I noticed that the Government-subsidized Time magazine said that I roared. I think it is time for somebody to roar about the failure of the users of the mail in this country to pay for the services that they are receiving from the Post Office Department.

Just one other thought. Our people have been inconvenienced by the order of last Saturday. That was a hurried order. I found one situation in my city Friday night when I returned home. A contract station called me and said "We are not permitted to accept parcel post packages on Saturday." I called the Postmaster General at his hotel in Washington, and that order was countermanded immediately.

Now, I do say this, since industry and business are going to a 5-day week, the time has come when we should begin to curtail our Saturday service to some extent. I do not think it ought to be discontinued, but I do think there should be some study along that line. I am told by the Post Office Department that by not delivering third class mail on Saturdays we can save \$10 million a year. When that class of mail is not paying the expense of its delivery, why should we not save \$10 million a year. I want to see the people of this country get all the service that they pay for, but when they do not pay for the service, I do not think they can expect champagne service at beer prices.

There is just one other feature that I want to discuss. I think there are some places that we can cut the service that will not hurt. This administration has decentralized the postal service. What they have done is this: They have established 15 brandnew regional offices throughout the United States. They have established 91 new district offices throughout the United States. In each of these regional offices they have practically duplicated the setup of the office here in Washington. In the district offices they have employed additional help, and while there is not a complete duplication, there is a partial duplication. They have put into those offices a lot of high salaried personnel that we have not had before. Frankly, I cannot see that the service has been benefited one iota.

I understand the statement was made the other day that prior to decentralization the mail piled up here in Washington. I was told the other day that one of my constituents had a question of classification that had been tied up

in the district and regional offices for 1 year and in the Washington office for 2 months, making a total of 14 months.

Now with respect to these regional and district offices: I used to enjoy vaudeville. I can remember a corny joke I heard in vaudeville many years ago. It probably stuck in my mind because it was so corny. Two would-be comedians come out on the stage and one of them said to the other, "John, if that post over there were to fall on us, what would you do?" And the other said, "I would call the postmaster." The first one said, "Why?" And just as quick as a flash he said, "To get the post off us."

Today, you would not know whether to call the postmaster, the district manager, the regional director, or a supervisor. The situation has become so complicated under decentralization that nobody knows today where the postmaster's jurisdiction ceases, where the district manager's jurisdiction begins, or where the regional director fits into the picture. There is a wide area for economies in this confusing setup.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SUMMERFIELD AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, a great furor has arisen over the attempt of the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, to sandbag Congress into giving him the total amount of money he requests for the operation of the Post Office Department. Here are the facts.

The committee appropriated practically the entire budget request for the current fiscal year which began July 1, 1956. Until a few years ago it was the general practice among the Federal bureaus and departments to use all of the money appropriated such department for any one fiscal year before the end of the year and come back to the next Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation. This practice meant that the Congress had absolutely no control over expenditures but was at the mercy of the departments which could spend under such practice the sums of money they saw fit instead of the sums appropriated by the Congress. To prevent this practice, a law known as the antideficiency law was passed by the Congress. This law requires the heads of the various departments to apportion the money for expenditure of a certain maximum amount in each quarter, the total not to exceed the amount appropriated for the entire fiscal year. Most of the departments now follow the law and if an emergency arises during the year which makes it impossible for the department to operate on the appropriation previously made by the Congress, the department comes to the Appropriations Committee before it makes the expenditures and gets the authority of the Congress to exceed the quarterly amount by the sum required for the emergency.

During the current fiscal year which began July 1 of last year, Mr. Summerfield did not follow this practice but in October, again in December, and again in January changed the allocations of

the money appropriated to him and spent it needlessly to support the 15 regional offices set up by him and which are of no earthly use but which cost millions of dollars more than the operation of the Department costs when the affairs of the Department were administered from Washington. In addition many unnecessary district offices were set up at additional cost.

So instead of coming to the Congress before he spent sums in excess of his quarterly allocations, he waited until January when he came to the subcommittee which makes appropriations for his Department and demanded that a certain amount be appropriated for the remaining months of the year. This was a distinct violation of the antideficiency law.

In the meantime, he asked the Budget Bureau to send a request for additional funds to the Appropriations Committee. The Budget Bureau believing such funds unnecessary and expressing that belief to members of the subcommittee handling these appropriations, refused to request the committee for additional funds. However Mr. Summerfield continued to pressure his fellow Republican, Mr. Brundage, head of the Budget Bureau, until the latter surrendered and sent a request to the committee on March 12 for the additional appropriation.

The committee after a hearing and careful consideration of the request decided that while Mr. Summerfield had violated the law and spent money illegally, an appropriation of \$17 million additional would be justified because an act of Congress had increased the cost by \$17 million. Mr. Summerfield was told that this amount would be appropriated when the committee could take regular action on the bill.

Instead of doing as other department heads do and accepting the money appropriated by the Congress, he immediately threatened to curtail the postal service in various ways. Finally in order to put tremendous pressure upon the Congress to do just as he wished, he proposed to close the post offices on Saturday, to stop issuing money orders, and otherwise curtail the postal service. He is quite arrogant and apparently has a contempt for Congress as so many of the bureaucrats do.

SHALL THE PEOPLE THROUGH THEIR CONGRESS,
OR THE BUREAUCRATS, CONTROL EXPENDITURES?

This is the vital question posed by Mr. Summerfield's actions in violation of the law and his threats to curtail the postal service. We are being constantly urged to cut expenditures so that the people can be given a tax reduction. The Appropriations Committee of which I am a member has been trying to do just that and has succeeded in making many cuts. Now the question is, Do the people back home want the Congress to surrender to Mr. Summerfield and let him say what amount is to be spent for postal service or do you want your Representatives in Congress to hold the purse strings? This is the problem and this is the real question involved. Whatever Mr. Summerfield may say to the contrary, this is the inescapable problem posed by his con-

temptuous and arrogant conduct toward the Congress.

SUMMERFIELD WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CURTAILED POSTAL SERVICE

If your postal service is curtailed temporarily or permanently, it will be the fault of Mr. Summerfield who violated the law by making unauthorized expenditures—many say for political purposes—during the first 9 months of the year. If we surrender to him and permit him to violate the antideficiency law, the other departments will demand the same treatment. If so, the Congress might as well shut up shop and turn the handling of your tax money over to the bureaucrats.

It is not a question of whether we shall appropriate money for foreign aid or for any other purpose. The Appropriations Committee will take care of cutting foreign aid and other funds where possible, but we should not and cannot be expected to surrender to the arrogant demands of a power-drunk bureaucrat. I have, and will continue, to vote against any such surrender.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the House this week approved the second appropriations bill for the Post Office Department during this session—the first being the regular annual departmental appropriations bill, carrying funds in excess of \$3 billion for postal services—the second bill being a supplemental appropriation, carrying an additional \$41 million for the Department.

The Postmaster General—General Summerfield—has publicly contended that this latter appropriation is needed for the operation of all the services in the Department through June 30, the end of the Government fiscal year.

As indicated, the Congress has appropriated to date more than \$3 billion for the Department, the exact amount being \$3,197,000,000 plus the additional \$41 million this week approved. Besides these appropriations, it should be pointed out that Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, has the authority to transfer funds from one operation to another at his discretion.

Notwithstanding the cooperation of the Congress in providing these funds for services to the public by the Department, the Postmaster General has threatened to completely shut down the operation of the Post Office if the full funds he demanded is not immediately provided.

It should be pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget in the White House, that initially passes on all departmental requests for funds, has twice rejected the Postmaster General's requests for additional funds. The Budget Bureau only recently submitted its approval for the supplemental funds to Congress. Had this latter request been received earlier, the Congress could have acted earlier and the apparent urgency of the situation would have been avoided. The Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have acted in accordance with usual and customary procedure in these matters and not under force of threats, intimidation, and pressure.

Certainly, there exists no desire on the part of anyone to curtail essential postal services to the public. However, many Members of Congress feel that the Post Office Department should practice some economy as other agencies of the Government. Hearings before the Post Office Committee on the Appropriations Committee have established that the Department is expending huge sums of money in the setting up of 15 new regional supervisory offices and about 100 new branch supervisory offices throughout the United States. These new offices have been staffed by highly paid personnel and increases in funds requested by the Department have resulted in expenditures of funds being transferred from services to support these new offices. There exists the opinion here in Washington that the Postmaster General has ordered limited service curtailment—for a limited time—for two primary reasons; the first being to dramatize the need for increasing the postal rates to the public which he has long advocated and the other reason being political.

With more than \$3 billion available in appropriations to the Department, plus the authority to transfer funds from one operation to another, there certainly should be no need to suspend mail service, even temporarily, to the public.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, to one who does not know anything about the operations of the Post Office Department—except that as he puts a stamp on a letter and drops it in the mail box, the addressee gets it, and on time, and that sometimes one gets a letter—this does seem to be about as ridiculous a situation as even the Congress of the United States can get into.

We created the Post Office Department. We have written certain laws telling the Department what it must do; what kind of mail it shall accept and what the charge for that service shall be, how much the employees shall be paid, and many other directions and restrictions.

We tell the Postmaster General what to do and how, but we do not give him enough money to do it—then we complain when he refuses to carry out our orders when, if he did, he would violate the law we have written.

Now it just happens that we have a Republican postmaster and all at once the charge is that the law is being violated.

When given the privilege of coming here, what most amazed me was the fact that the Congress could have a deficiency bill. It has always been my thought that when money was given to me or when I earned money and I spent it for a particular purpose, that was it; that was the end of that incident. But inquiry of the Parliamentarian as to how many deficiency bills could be brought in elicited the information that we could have as many as the congressional com-

mittee wanted to bring in. And if a Department did not get enough money the first time, it could come back and ask again; and if it did not get enough money then, they could come back again and again and ultimately the Congress would give the Department what was needed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have 5 deficiency bills before us today, do we not—5 more?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We may have more; I do not know. But having created the Department, and having a Postmaster General under whose direction it is supposed to operate, and having told him by law what he should do—let me interrupt myself. There are two remedies. We can either curtail the service or—well, the other one would not work. That is, we cannot prevent people being born and learning to read and write and wanting to get postal service, nor can we prevent the expansion of the service demanded by increasing businesses. I would not subscribe to either. But fortunately our population has grown, as has business. We have had some refugees, some others have been admitted and apparently many wish to write letters to the friends they have left abroad, telling what a wonderful country this is, and they want to get letters. What a howl would have gone up if the Postmaster had curtailed the service before he did. And that is apparently what he should have done if he had desired to meet the approval of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] or if the Bureau of the Budget failed to abide by the strict letter of law.

If there is a Member of this House who has not had requests for the extension of rural routes, for carrier service in growing communities, for additional service—all of which cost dollars—it would be a pleasure to meet that gentleman, because certainly he must be happier than some of the rest of us are today.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. There has been a good deal said about how unusual it is for the Post Office Department to ask for a supplemental appropriation or a deficiency appropriation. With the gentleman's permission, may I read figures showing what has happened with appropriations for the Post Office Department?

In 1947 Congress gave the Post Office Department a supplemental appropriation of \$93 million. In 1948 Congress voted \$172,700,000 in a supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department. In 1949 there was a supplemental appropriation of \$140,800,000. In 1950, it was \$71,400,000; in 1951, \$29,400,000; and in 1952, \$250,000.

Now, let us see what has happened under Postmaster General Summerfield. In 1953 he turned back—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no?

Mr. MURRAY. He turned back \$83,574,247.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman realize Mr. Summerfield is a Republican Postmaster General?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I am just giving the gentleman facts and figures.

In 1955 he turned back \$108,724,572. Next year he turned back \$42,993,628. So in 3 successive years he turned back over \$200 million of the appropriation given by Congress.

Since he has been Postmaster General, since 1953, this is his second request for a supplemental appropriation. In 1956 he received a supplemental appropriation of \$16 million. The supplemental appropriation now pending is the second one he has asked for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At any time during that period did the gentleman hear any complaint from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MURRAY. None whatever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman listening?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Did the gentleman hear any word of commendation of the Postmaster General from certain sources?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean during this debate?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I mean at any time, for the money that was turned back.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course the gentleman realizes that each of us cannot hear everything that is said. That is just impossible. Inasmuch as the Congress has been under the control of our Democratic friends, I would not expect there would be too much commendation along that line.

Repeatedly it has been said here that there has been a violation of the law. We have heard read the letter from the Comptroller General. As far as it was my privilege to understand the situation, the only violation there has been was because the Bureau of the Budget, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee will set me right on it, did not send up a notification of a deficiency as soon as it should.

Mr. MURRAY. That is entirely correct. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget failed to send up the request when it was first made last July and held it up until March 12 of this year. I do not know the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but he gave as an excuse that he understood the revenues of the Department were increasing, which is true, and that there would be a \$20 million increase in postal revenues. He thought that the Postmaster General could use the increased revenue to pay for the operating expenses of the Department, which of course is not true. All postal revenues go into the General Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He made a mistake of about \$20 million. He thought it would come to the Post Office Department and it went into the Treasury of the United States. That is the situation, is it not? He thought a saving might be made?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what all the, if the word may be used, "squawk" is about here today. That is the only foundation there is, as I can read the record, for the charge of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the law has been violated. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], when he was talking here a few moments ago, referred directly to a violation not by the Bureau of the Budget, not by the Postmaster General, but by his own committee. I had not heard that until today when it slipped out. The violation has been nothing but a technical one, for which there is no penalty, as I understand it, and if I am wrong, again I will ask the chairman of the Post Office Committee to correct me. Is there any penalty attached to the violation of which the Bureau of the Budget may be guilty?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand there is no penalty whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, where and what do we get? Charges that the Postmaster General has violated the law and is responsible for the present curtailment of the service. A political charge that is without foundation. Where does the blame belong? Right over there with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has been familiar with the situation all along. When the Postmaster General came up finally and said that he would not violate the law by continuing service as it then existed, that unless he was given money to operate as we had directed one of two things must happen—he must either violate the law or he must curtail the services.

The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]—I cannot say he got his back up—nobody knows what transpires in his head—but he decided, at least said, the Postmaster General was holding a gun at the head of the Congress, and was bluffing, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] called what he characterized the Postmaster's bluff. And what happened? The Postmaster General just was not bluffing. He obeyed the law, and stood by his guns and cut the service as he was forced to do. The present curtailment in services is due to the action of no one except that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. There on the Democratic side sets the person who is responsible for the recent cut in service, for the failure of postal employees to be on their jobs. What are we to do about it. The House will do as it should have done a week or two ago. It will appropriate the necessary funds notwithstanding all the talk of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. The only thing that was wrong, as I can read the record, was that when the third quarter rolled around, they transacted their business by using the fourth-quarter funds. The Postmaster General, if I understand the situation transferred funds supposed to be used after one date over to an earlier period. Is that what it was? They transferred money, for example, from the third to the second quarter in order to continue to operate?

Mr. MURRAY. They transferred funds from the fourth quarter 3 or 4 different times to the first, second, and third. Those transfers were made at the direction and with the approval and on the order of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And nobody said anything about it at the time; did they?

Mr. MURRAY. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the only thing the Postmaster could have done at that time is what he later did, and that was to curtail the services; was it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from the third congressional district who is so ably representing his district, who is on the Post Office Committee.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. I was disturbed by the answer that was given by the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Virginia [Mr. GARY] when the question was asked, I believe, by the gentleman from New York as to what the Postmaster General should have done if he discovered a deficiency and he was going to have to transfer these funds at a time when the Congress was not in session, and the only answer given was that that was an administrative problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, no. What he could have done was to have done then just what he did later and that was to cut the services and that is the only thing the Postmaster could have done at any time. Why all this hollering and yelling and making of charges with justification now. The only thing I can figure out is that the Postmaster General happens to be a Republican and this is the time—this is the year when they are after the Republican Party with 1958 in mind. They loved Ike; many of them supported Ike but now they would tear him and his administration to pieces.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I was asked the question a few moments ago as to what the Postmaster General could do if he went to the Budget Director on two occasions and asked for a transfer of funds which he had to have, and the Budget Director refused to give it to him. They asked me what he could do under those circumstances. What he could have done was to have gone to the President of the United States who is the coordinating officer and he could have directed the Budget Director to send the proper request to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Nonsense. The Congress knew the money was needed, the Congressman calling the tune but did not want to pay the piper. Yes; and if the President had authorized the expenditure we would have heard a howl go up all over the place. The politicians would have had something to talk about other than the helicopter, the speed at which his chauffeur drives, a red spot on his nose, and the President's health. The only thing the Postmaster General could have done and the only

thing he can do today, and the only thing he can do in the future when he comes before the Appropriation Committee of the Congress and the Congress fails to give him money necessary to operate is to cut off the services or violate the law. Now, if our people are displeased, if they are sore about anything, they should direct their wrath to and at the gentleman, as I said before, from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. There is where they should go. He is the gentleman responsible for the lack of funds which cut down the postal service, the loss of compensation of employees who were out of work. The gentleman from Missouri is the boss of the Appropriations Committee, he is a master of inconsistency, but he is not, as yet, running the Department of the Post Office—as he has recently learned the hard way. I stand by this statement—there is not a Member of this House who has not had requests for additional services either for an extension of routes or for more frequent deliveries in, for example, carrier service in cities which have grown—and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] seems to be nodding his head in the affirmative. Evidently, he has heard from his home folks as have we all. I hope when this bill comes up for a vote the gentleman will not only vote to give the present Postmaster General what he needs, but you will have a word of praise as other good members of your party have had since this issue came up.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. For the purpose of the RECORD, and for the economy-minded Members of this Congress, it might be well to point out that this deficiency appropriation in toto represents one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] thought it sufficient to hang a political charge on, and that is all this argument is about. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] just for a few days thought he was Postmaster General. Being from Missouri, he asked to be shown—and he was. What the Congress has done was to create a Department, tell it to operate in a certain way, and then the Committee on Appropriations, under the guidance of its chairman, for a few days refused deliberately to give the Postmaster General funds enough to carry out the orders of the Congress.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the statements of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the decision of the Comptroller General held that the law was violated. In response to a request of the Postmaster General for an opinion on this point, Comptroller Campbell wrote in a detailed and authoritative opinion on April 12, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 12, 1957.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Your letter of April 4, 1957, requests a statement of our

findings resulting from a study of the records of the Post Office Department to ascertain whether during fiscal year 1957 there has been a violation of the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), commonly known as the Antideficiency Act. An informal request for similar advice was received from a staff member of the House Appropriations Committee following the hearings March 26 and 27, and April 3, 1957, before the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, on the Post Office Department's supplemental request for funds for operations.

At the outset, we wish to explain that our review was made in a very limited time to obtain information readily available as to whether the Post Office Department had violated the Antideficiency Act. Because of the time limit, our review was restricted to a comparison of apportionments, by appropriation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the postal quarterly reporting periods ended October 19, 1956, and January 11, 1957, with obligations incurred for the same quarters as they appear in published statements of the Post Office Department. No over-obligation of the apportionments for those quarters was revealed by this comparison. Results of operations for the postal quarter ending April 5, 1957, were not available at the time of our review.

We did not review the obligations under administrative subdivisions of funds within the apportionments, but we were informed that in the quarter ended October 19, 1956, funds allotted to two regional directors had been overobligated by \$27,613 and the required reports to the President and the Congress were made on February 14, 1957.

Your letter, however, and the committee inquiry request our findings as to whether the provisions of the Antideficiency Act were violated during fiscal year 1957. This requires consideration not only of the question as to whether the apportionment of the funds for the fiscal year 1957 were overobligated but also as to whether they were made in accordance with the provisions of that act, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. * * *

"(d) (2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. * * *

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific

amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulas prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report."

Since the Department's supplemental request for funds for fiscal year 1957 is limited to the appropriation for operations, what is said hereinafter is addressed to that appropriation.

The apportionments of that appropriation, with a possible exception of about \$2 million referred to on page 97 of the House hearings on the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, do not appear to come within the exceptions set out in subsection (e) (1) above and, apparently, subsection (e) was not relied upon in making the apportionments. The communication transmitting the supplemental estimates to the Congress March 12, 1957, contains no reference to any detailed report to the Congress of the facts involved as required in subsection (e) (2), and the testimony in these hearings contains no indication of reliance upon subsection (e) (1) in making the apportionments.

The apportionment of appropriations to prevent deficiency or supplemental appropriations was first required in the amendment to section 3679, Revised Statutes, contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1905, 33 Stat. 1257. Section 3679, Revised Statutes, was amended again by section 3 of the act of February 23, 1906, 34 Stat. 27, 48, and lastly, by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, 64 Stat. 765. Each of these amendments was intended to reduce further the need for deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

Even prior to the complete revision of section 3679 in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, the Anti-Deficiency Act was considered to require that appropriations be apportioned so as to prevent either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. In House Report No. 221, 79th Congress, 1st session, on the First Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1945, it is stated:

"The committee met with instances which indicated either a lack of knowledge or an utter disregard of the so-called antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665), in that agencies reported overobligations during the first half of the current fiscal year to an extent which places the Congress in the position either of granting additional funds or forcing the curtailment of operations which in some cases would be unwise and harmful. That sort of practice cannot be continued, particularly when the Congress is in continuous session. It must be stopped."

In House Report No. 1817, 79th Congress, 2d session, on the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1946, it is stated:

"Instances have occurred where agencies do not actually incur deficiencies but proceed at an obligational rate which make necessary either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. The committee does not propose to tolerate that practice any longer. It intends to see that the antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665) is observed in letter and spirit and shall expect the Bureau of the Budget to report quarterly, starting at the close of the first quarter of the next fiscal year, the title of any appropriation not being administered in accordance with the letter and spirit of such law, the reasons therefor, and the name and

position of the official immediately responsible."

The foregoing quotation was referred to in a letter dated August 22, 1946, of the Assistant Chief, Estimates, Bureau of the Budget, to the Postmaster General printed at page 116 of the Senate hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill for 1947. As recorded on page 142 of those hearings, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, after hearing testimony as to deficiencies which had occurred in the Post Office Department, requested the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office to review the problem and submit a report thereon.

The Acting Director of Bureau of the Budget and the Acting Comptroller General jointly submitted a report on June 5, 1947, B-66949, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with the understanding that the subcommittee desired recommendations (1) as to what can be done to control the use of appropriations so as to prevent the incurring of obligations at a rate which will lead to deficiency or supplemental appropriations or to curtailment of necessary activities if such appropriations are not made; and (2) to fix responsibility on those officers of the Government who incur deficiencies or obligate appropriations without proper authorization or at an excessive rate. Included in the report was a draft of legislation to accomplish those two purposes.

This draft of legislation to amend section 3679, Revised Statutes, with some revisions, was enacted as section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. A section-by-section analysis of that proposed legislation appears on pages 6835-6836 of volume 96, part 5, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is stated in that analysis that subsection (1) (c) is "designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to

the end of the period for which the appropriation was made and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation, or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

A drastic curtailment toward the close of a fiscal year of operations carried on under a fiscal year appropriation is a prima facie indication of a failure to so apportion an appropriation as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. In our view, this is the very situation the amendment of the law in 1950 was intended to remedy. This view is entirely consistent with the views expressed in the joint report dated June 5, 1947, of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office. In view thereof and the legislative history of the Antideficiency Act set out above, subsection (c) (1) of the act must be, and is, construed as a mandate of the Congress that fiscal year appropriations be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate the necessity for either a deficiency or supplemental appropriation or a drastic curtailment of the activity for which an appropriation is made.

The responsibility for making the apportionments is vested in the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by subsection (d) (2) of the act, which also requires the head of the agency concerned to submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of the appropriation. The apportionment and reapportionments as made by the Bureau of the Budget for the appropriation "Operations, Post Office Department, 1957," including transfers and reimbursements, are set out below:

Date	1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	4th quarter
June 13, 1956.....	\$624,306,000	\$547,611,000	\$473,766,000	\$474,909,000
July 10, 1956.....	623,429,500	546,988,100	473,112,100	474,255,700
July 13, 1956.....	630,429,500	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Aug. 30, 1956.....	630,326,100	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Oct. 4, 1956.....	635,326,100	551,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Dec. 14, 1956.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	466,612,000	463,884,900
Jan. 11, 1957.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	464,612,000	463,884,900
Feb. 4, 1957.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	484,612,000	443,884,900

The Post Office Department operates on 4-week accounting periods adjusted at the beginning and end of the fiscal year. The first-, second-, third-, and fourth-quarter columns in the above table actually represent 4 (less 1 day), 3, 3, and 3 (plus 2 days) accounting periods of 4 weeks each. The significant reapportionments were made on July 13 and December 14, 1956, and February 4, 1957. On July 13, 1956, the first quarter was increased \$7 million and the third and fourth quarters were decreased \$3,500,000 each. On December 14, 1956, the second quarter was increased \$10 million and the third and fourth quarters were further decreased by \$3 million and approximately \$7 million, respectively. On February 4, 1957, the third quarter was increased \$20 million and the fourth quarter was decreased by \$20 million. These 3 reapportionments decreased the fourth quarter apportionment by a total of approximately \$30,500,000, which resulted in the fourth quarter apportionment being \$40,727,100 less than the third quarter apportionment which covered 2 days less time.

The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional

funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47 million, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957, before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the services of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for "Operations" or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (i) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment

of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Antideficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the House Committee on Appropriations, to Senator BYRD, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,

Comptroller General of the United States.

As will be noted the Comptroller held that the Director of the Budget, at the repeated importunity of the Postmaster General, had violated the Antideficiency Act. That makes the Postmaster General in effect an accessory before the fact and his repeated insistence, in the language of the opinion, "not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act. It is a reproach on both the administration and the Department. All all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about Democratic attacks on the Postmaster General. I have a letter from a constituent of mine, a dentist out in Ohio, who happens to be a Republican. He says:

There is a persistent rumor being circulated locally that our Postmaster General has threatened to resign his office.

Frankly, since learning that our local post office will be locked Saturday, postal money orders will be discontinued effective April 15, and third-class mail will no longer be available, I am not merely in favor of such a resignation—I am definitely enthusiastic about it.

Maybe such a move might start a trend toward giving the country back to the people for a change. Goodness knows it has been long, long overdue. And then, there is that old-fashioned thought that most of us cling to—the postal service is by no stretch of the imagination a privilege. It is a right.

If the Postmaster General has handled his Chevrolet business in Michigan as inefficiently as he has the Postal Department, he is either broke or his personal finances must surely be in bad shape. Accordingly, and since it is just "not fittin'" that a man of his age and financial destitution should be forced to thumb his way back to Michigan, I am enclosing my personal check in the amount of \$1. This will help to defray the expense of sending him back home by the fastest available means—and at the earliest possible date.

I realize the amount of the check is rather insignificant, but I feel that it is all I can afford—with all my other numerous charitable contributions. I am sure, however, that the project can be oversubscribed several hundred times in Washington within the first couple of minutes.

Incidentally, I will accept any other contributions you want to send.

Then he says further:

It is possibly worthy of note (and perhaps should rate a special stamp to commemorate the achievement) that he has done what neither the Indians, road agents, bandits, nor the elements ever succeeded in doing during our entire history—disrupted the United States mail.

He is a Republican and he sent a check for \$1 made out to the "Summerfield

Transportation Fund." Down in the corner where it says "For," he has "Homecoming."

I tried to get the gentleman from New Jersey to yield a while ago when he was reading off the postal rates charged in France, Russia, and every place else around the globe, but he did not see fit to yield at that time, because I wanted to ask him a question as to whether or not France, Germany, and the rest of them carried Time and Life magazines free, or practically free. You hear a lot about the postal deficit. My good friend from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] comes in from time to time with a bill to raise postal rates. I have not yet voted for any of his bills because up to now he has not brought in one to raise the rates on the people who are causing the deficit. I do not have anything against Time or Life magazines, except the fact that they are not paying their way.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. How can you say we have not done anything to increase the second- and third-class rates?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, you have not brought them up to where they ought to be. You did bring in a bill to raise first-class rates by 33 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. And how much for second class?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Ten percent, I think it was, for second-class, was it not?

Mr. MURRAY. No, no.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman have any bill which would make these magazines pay their own way? Will the gentleman answer me Yes or No on that?

Mr. MURRAY. The bill provided for an increase of 10 percent on the reading matter contained in the magazines and 120 percent on the advertising content.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Would that have left any deficit?

Mr. MURRAY. It would have left considerable of a deficit.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is it, and that is the point I am trying to make. In other words, they would still be taking a partial free ride at the taxpayers' expense. I am only using Time and Life as an example. There are plenty of other magazines taking a free ride. If you would come in here with a bill to make those magazines pay their way and could show me that the Post Office Department still does not have enough money to operate without a deficit, I might then be willing to raise the rate on other classes of mail which are already paying their way. Until you do I am not going to vote for any postal increase. I do not think my mail has demonstrated that my constituents do not want a postal increase that is fair, but they do want the different classes of mail to pay their own way. If there is any business that is making a profit it is the slick paper magazines, and their financial statements show it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, when the original Post Office appropriation measure was before the House, I voted against

reducing the amount requested. I did this with full knowledge that always heretofore, the Congress had allowed the supplemental funds asked for, and that eventually the Congress could do nothing but reverse its stand.

In my opinion, Mr. Summerfield met the challenge of the committee and House leaders in the only honorable and self-respecting manner open to him.

(Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorizations

For an additional amount for loans for the rural-electrification program, \$200 million, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language commencing on page 2, line 23, after the word, "as amended" and reading: "And to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020)."

Mr. Chairman, the public law referred to has nothing whatsoever to do with the authorization of REA, but is a loan authorization for construction of rural housing as provided in the Rural Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the act of 1956, which gives authorization to the Secretary of Agriculture to issue such debentures as necessary to carry out the authority contained in section 11 of the act of 1949.

I submit that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking to make a record in this Congress in reducing the budget. There are two ways in which we can increase the budget: We can increase it by appropriating money in excess of the President's budget requests, or we can grant new obligational authority through legislation directly affecting Government spending, but not through regular appropriation channels.

We asked President Eisenhower to tell us how we could reduce this big \$72 billion budget. We passed a resolution and sent it to him asking him how it might be reduced. The President, when he sent up his request here for \$200 million for loans for the REA, took into consideration that the money was needed, but he said we should provide this additional authorization by making these funds

available from loan authorizations contained in section 606 of the act of August 7, 1956, which is the Rural Housing Act. Last year we passed a rural public-housing bill authorizing loans in the sum of \$450 million. We authorized loans in that sum. That showed in the budget as an additional obligation of the Government. It does show as an additional obligation of the Government to the extent of \$450 million. We would, of course, hope and believe that the loans would eventually be repaid to the Government. So the President said: "We will not use all of this housing money. The law will expire in 1961 and we will not use half of it," as shown on page 40 of the hearings. He said that they would only use about \$27 million at this time and that one-half of the sum would never be used. He said this money would not be needed. So he proposed to transfer from the \$450 million in housing loan authority the sum of \$200 million for the REA. Through such a procedure the overall obligations of the Government would not be increased.

On the Department of Labor bill we worked for a week to reduce appropriations by \$130 million. Here, by reason of this point of order, we are proposing to increase the obligational authority of the Government by \$200 million. I agree that in the labor bill a direct appropriation is involved and in this action obligational authority of a different type is involved. In both cases funds can be taken from the Treasury. The housing funds and the REA funds will in time be repaid to the Government after a period of years when the loans come due. The point is in each case funds will be withdrawn from the Treasury and the obligational authority of the Government is increased. The public debt will likewise be increased to the extent of the appropriations expended on the loans made. Of course, the Government will get credit when the loan money is repaid. If we increase the President's obligational budget by \$200 million we will wipe out in a moment one-fifth of the savings we have made this year below the President's big budget.

Let us not increase the President's budget by \$200 million. Let us transfer this obligation from rural housing to the REA, all within the Department of Agriculture. Everyone agrees the \$200 million will not be used by the housing program. When the final chapter of this Congress is written the point of order will be responsible for a \$200 million increase in the President's budget in funds available for expenditure. This will make Congress look bad. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Texas is saying to the committee that the Appropriations Committee feels it has incurred the responsibility to legislate in the field of rural housing, which was passed by this Congress in 1949, and repeatedly included in every Housing Act up to 1956. There-

fore, the question as to whether or not there should be a public debt transaction has to be decided by the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me a very curious arrangement that the Appropriations Committee did not go farther and enact legislation which would provide that the loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration should not be a public debt transaction—go the whole hog—instead of coming in here in such a way as to preclude the authorizations and the work to be completed under the Farmers Home Administration. To carry out that program you commit one sin to protect the other sin you hope to commit in the future.

Mr. MAHON. I want to make it clear that I do not approve of the method being used by the President in requesting the \$200 million for the REA. I think the direct request should have been made by the Bureau of the Budget and that REA should stand on its own feet and that the housing program should stand on its merits. I do not want to see the REA or the housing program crippled, and if the administration would utilize the \$450 million housing authorization, I would be opposed to any transfer whatever. I do not like the transfer method. I am simply saying, however, that we have no other alternative except to increase the President's budget by \$200 million, and I would like to avoid that.

The gentleman from Alabama, if he insists upon this point of order, will be responsible for increasing the President's budget by \$200 million. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Alabama. I can see his position. He is a good legislator. Basically, I agree with his position. I am just trying to avoid increasing the President's budget by such a large sum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I feel we ought to allow the language to stay in the bill as it stands.

Mr. MAHON. It was written by the budget and by the administration, not by the committee.

Mr. TABER. When the department was up here it said that even if this year's expenses were doubled next year and maintained at that rate through 1961, this would only indicate a need for \$225 million for housing operations.

Mr. MAHON. The following is contained in the President's budget request to Congress, and it is contained in the bill which is before us:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
Loan authorizations

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200 million, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020).

I now quote from a statement by Mr. Joseph C. Wheeler, Director of the Budg-

et of the Department of Agriculture, whose testimony appears on pages 39 and 40 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

Mr. WHEELER. House Document 115 includes proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for various agencies of the Government, submitted to the Congress by the President on March 12, 1957. In accordance with budgetary policy, most of the additional appropriations and authorizations required for unforeseen and emergency items are proposed to be financed by transfers from obligational authority already made available by the Congress. In transmitting the proposed supplemental appropriations to the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated as follows:

"In developing these recommendations the Bureau of the Budget has been guided by your statement in the 1958 budget message that 'efforts will continue to be made by every executive department and agency to improve efficiency and to maintain expenditures well within the budget estimates.'

"Requests for which tentative amounts were specifically forecast in the 1958 budget document have received the same strict review as other requests. Our objective has been to hold proposals for supplemental appropriations to a minimum, to require the absorption of additional needs within funds already available to the fullest extent possible and to search for offsetting savings."

In the case of the Department of Agriculture, requests totaling \$234,037,400 are included, of which \$229,037,400 are to be financed by transfer from other funds or authorizations already available. Included within these totals is an increase of \$200 million in the authorization for REA loans. A recent survey of borrowers' needs shows that applications for rural electrification loans will total about \$453 million in fiscal year 1957. At the time the budget estimates were prepared last fall, the latest survey figures available to the Rural Electrification Administration indicated that 1957 applications would total only about \$270 million. This proposed transfer of authorization would make it possible to meet this increased need for rural electrification loan funds in 1957 and provide a margin to continue the higher level loan program into 1958.

It is proposed to meet this need by transferring \$200 million of the \$450 million loan authorization for farm housing loans for the period 1957 through 1961, contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956. Based on experience so far this fiscal year in operating under the farm housing loan authorization, \$450 million is considerably in excess of what will be needed through 1961. Despite the fact that \$50 million was initially set up for use during this fiscal year, it now appears that not more than one-half that amount will be needed or used. Even if this year's experience were doubled next year and maintained at that rate through 1961, this would indicate a need for only \$225 million. Therefore, it was decided that the urgent need for additional electrification loans could be met in this manner without detriment to the farm housing program.

In summary, the proposal is in implementation of the determination stated on numerous occasions by the President to do everything possible to keep new obligational authority and expenditures within current budget totals and to meet unforeseen or emergency needs within existing authorizations.

The above-quoted statement from the Budget Director of the Department of Agriculture indicates that the transfer of obligational authority from the housing program to the rural-electrification program will do no injury to the housing

program. If we follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, we will not increase the overall obligational authority of the Government. If the point of order is sustained, we increase the overall obligational authority of the Government in the sum of \$200 million, increasing the budget to that extent.

This Congress last year exceeded the President's budget in excess of \$1 billion by reason of these kinds of transactions, granting additional obligational authority, as is proposed here. So we worked so hard to make reductions, and why increase the budget by \$200 million when the funds will not otherwise be used?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman's argument defeats itself. You say we are not going to use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph on loan authorizations.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order that the part of the sentence that I raised the point of order against be sustained and not as to the entire paragraph. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that point of order has not been disposed of and the chair cannot entertain other points of order without disposing of the pending question before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, the point of order was reserved.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; it was reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard?

Mr. BOW. I desire to say this, Mr. Chairman: My point of order is in order at this time inasmuch as the gentleman reserved his, and the argument I would make against the entire paragraph is the same argument the gentleman made on his point of order to strike certain language. Where a point of order is raised to a portion of a paragraph, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order, and I insist on my point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to be heard on the point of order made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The point of order which the gentleman from Ohio raises is to the entire paragraph. Now, there is no question as to the authority of the Committee on Appropriations to make appropriations available for the Rural Electrification Administration program. There is no restriction, nor is it a limitation, but it is a general authority by which the Committee on Appropriations would have authority to make appropriations.

Now, the point of order that I raise is to preclude the Committee on Appropriations writing into this bill legislation which is not authorized under pending law but taking the appropriation item and making it a credit against the Housing Act of 1949 and 1956 as amended.

So, the argument made that this will increase the debt and at the same time that the Secretary of Agriculture will not utilize the moneys, is inconsistent to me, Mr. Chairman, and would not hold water. I do not think, nor would it be advisable any more than it would to take it out of funds available for the Atomic Energy Commission for some of its activities to carry on REA.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to ask if the gentleman insists on his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

Mr. BOW. I insist on my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama on line 23, page 2, is against the three lines beginning with the word "and" as being legislation upon an appropriation bill, which it obviously is.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio, however, offers a point of order against the entire paragraph. As the language which is sought to be stricken by the gentleman from Alabama is subject to a point of order and is part of the paragraph, then the whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, and the Chair is constrained to sustain both points of order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: On page 2, after line 17, insert:

"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
"Loan authorizations

"For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to do that which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who just spoke on the point of order, attempted to do. In other words, it restores language which your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations wrote into the bill in the first instance. When we went before the full committee the other day, the full committee saw fit to write language in the bill which transferred from the rural housing program to the REA certain funds, \$200 million. Your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations unanimously reported the language which is in the amendment which is now before us.

Your committee felt that the Rural Electrification Administration program should be kept entirely separate. We do know that some Members have heard from REA organizations throughout the country. They have been very insistent that they did not want their own authorizations tied up with other programs. I can rightly see why they take that stand, because it is poor practice for them to have their own authorizations affected by transfers from other programs. It does not make for a good, healthy feel-

ing in the country when some of those things take place.

I think we ought to be careful when we do write legislation on an appropriation bill, because some of those things do have far-reaching effect. Some of the things that we do sometimes cause trouble and confusion, and, on top of that, they may do things that we do not intend to do. Certainly, as far as we are concerned, in going over appropriation bills we are doing what we can to stay within the budget. In fact, we are doing what we can to reduce the budget below the amount the President requested, the largest peacetime budget in history. Appropriation bills are one thing, expenditures are another. I want to point out that this is an authorization, and it is an authorization for REA's to increase their borrowing power. This comes about because of the greater demand that REA has for its services and because of the demand that faces REA organizations to firm up their lines. No one anticipated when the Rural Electrification Act was passed that it would need the heavy power lines to carry the heavy loads that REA carries at the present time. Many of the REA organizations have been handicapped by not having proper construction to take place.

The loans are paid back. The repayment record of the REA is remarkably good. Because that repayment record is so good, this cannot be considered in one breath as an expenditure, because it is not an expenditure. They are loans that are paid back.

As far as this particular program is concerned I am sure that Members of Congress want to see REA's given the funds that they need to operate with. I am also sure that the legislative committees of this House do not want the Committee on Appropriations to write legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas. I should like to say to him that I appreciate his fine courtesy and I am sorry that on this matter there seems to be some misunderstanding that exists between the gentleman from Texas and myself.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I agree that the President would have followed a much sounder practice, in my judgment, had he sent up a budget estimate for \$200 million, carrying the additional obligational authority of the Government. That is the way I think he ought to have done it. Then when we approved the \$200 million we would not be increasing the President's budget. But since there existed this obligational authority, which is, according to the President, not needed, on the rural housing program, he took advantage of the opportunity to say we transfer that obligational authority within the Department of Agriculture to the Rural Electrification Administration and we do not increase the overall obligational authority of the Government. I do not like that way of doing it, but while I do not like it I would rather do that than increase the present

budget by \$200 million. That hurts our economy record in Congress.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am sure my good friend from Texas agrees with me that under the parliamentary situation that exists at present my amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Sure, the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted, but I should like for us to have gotten this \$200 million without increasing the President's budget. Of course, over a period of years this loan money will be paid back, but we all know that it is an outstanding obligation of the Government until it is loaned out and repaid.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, since our subcommittee refused to go along with the recommendation of the President to cancel Housing lending authority before we authorized REA lending authority. I should like to make the record clear as I see it.

I can appreciate the feelings of my friend from Texas as far as holding down the possible expenditures of the Government is concerned. I hope I have a good record in that regard, myself. Certainly it is my desire to hold down expenditures. But the President's recommendation was to the effect that we increase the lending authority of the REA to meet this need, which is sound. The money will be repaid with interest. But in the recommendation our subcommittee was asked to repeal 40 percent of the basic legislation on farm housing, including farm structures.

I have heard so much from so many of our friends in the House about the action of the Appropriations Committee on this course of passing legislation. In the first place, I did not know whether or not it was sound to repeal 40 percent of the Rural Housing Authority; but certainly I knew it was unsound for a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to repeal 40 percent of the housing legislation that was law pure and simple, an act passed by the Congress and a part of the law of the land. It was not original action taken by our subcommittee we were asked to repeal. This was a recommendation that if we were going to give this lending authority to the REA, we were asked as an Appropriations Subcommittee, to repeal 40 percent of the basic legislation on housing. We just were not in shape to repeal this law, for this action was beyond our jurisdictional authority.

I am sorry my friend from Texas intimated in the committee, and has here, that our committee refused to go along in taking \$200 million out of the President's budget. If he had said: "Repeal the President's right to spend I would have agreed." We did not do as my friend indicated. We did not refuse to cut expenditures. We were not re-

quested to do that. We were asked as an appropriations subcommittee to repeal 40 percent of basic legislation on rural housing loans which was beyond our jurisdiction, beyond our reach. If, in a proper way, that matter is brought up for repeal I perhaps would vote for it, if we kept the other 60 percent. I do not know.

May I point out another thing: The President said the administration was not going to approve these loans for housing beyond the 60 percent which would have remained, which means the money would not have been spent. So the money is not going to be spent if the President holds the approvals down, as he says he is. We have done as we tried to do before, stick to the rules of the game and tend to our own knitting. If you want to repeal the Housing Act, you do it. Our subcommittee said we could not because we were not authorized to. Unfortunately, the whole committee reversed us. That was their privilege. But I do think we ought to make the record straight here. At any rate, the President's recommendations went out on the point of order. Now there is nothing we can do except adopt the amendment and make these loans available to the REA. If some other group wishes in a proper way to repeal the Housing Act, you do it. It was beyond our reach.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 37, noes 40.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 55, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VI

Post Office Department,

(Out of Postal Fund)

Operations

For an additional amount for "Operations," \$41 million.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 5, line 7, strike out "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$19,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time of the House any further. The Members have been very patient in listening to me. I think I have made a complete explanation of this item.

This amendment which I have offered will put into the bill the \$17 million recommended by our subcommittee, plus \$2 million, which was unquestionably within the exception of the antideficiency law. The total is \$19 million. The amendment gives the Congress the opportunity to vote specifically upon the question as to whether or not it wants

to capitulate to the threats and tactics of the Postmaster General and its control over the expenditures of this Government.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not going to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] this afternoon. He would allow only \$17 million required to pay certain additional salaries under the Reclassification Act of last year. He would provide for no additional funds for the great increase in the volume of mail; for the hundreds and hundreds of extra carrier routes that have to be provided. His amendment, in effect, would be a blow not only to the postal patrons of the United States but to the postal workers who have to serve us our mail.

Now, it has been made very clear these last few hours that the other body is ready to consider an appropriation of \$41 million and expedite such appropriation to the President of the United States.

Just a few moments ago there was some question about the action of the Post Office Department with reference to supplemental funds for the fiscal year 1957, dating back 9 months ago. I have just talked with the Bureau of the Budget here in Washington and I find that their records show that on July 12, 1956, the Bureau of the Budget advised the Post Office Department it was ready to entertain a supplemental for 1957 in the amount of \$30 million. Tack on to the \$30 million the \$17 million required under reclassification as mandated by the Congress of the United States and you have exactly the dollar figure now being requested by the Postmaster General, \$47 million. This supplemental was to be sent to the Senate for immediate consideration. The Senate suggested however, it was too late and indicated that it be pursued in the early months of this year. That is exactly what the Postmaster General has been doing and in a very proper way.

I urge that we reject this amendment and stick to the \$41 million voted out by the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 37 to 10.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Can the gentleman give us assurance that if this amendment is defeated and the \$41 million provided, that the money-order service and service to the third-class mail and all other services now suspended will be resumed?

Mr. CANFIELD. That I truly believe.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made, and I join with him in opposing this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. There has been no statement that the money is not needed to

operate the essential services of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, and the Department is very sensible and realistic in not spending or obligating funds it simply does not have.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take too much of the time of the Committee of the Whole in discussing this amendment. I do not think that is necessary. This amendment will and should be defeated.

This amount of \$41 million contained in line 7, page 5, was inserted in this bill when the amendment that I offered on Friday last in the full House Committee on Appropriations was adopted by the full committee by a vote of 37 to 10.

On Saturday and on yesterday in the city of New York there was great gloom as the result of the closing of the post offices. It seemed as though we were back in the war days again as the result of what has happened to the taxpayer and the postal employee in this pending hassle, which was caused either by the ignorance or the inability of the Postmaster General and/or the Director of the Budget. I believe the Comptroller General of the United States says they both violated the law.

On the facade of the general post office in Manhattan at 8th Avenue and 33d Street, in the city of New York, from whence is directed the activities, in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx alone, of 30,000 postal employees, we find the following inscription:

Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

On yesterday in Brooklyn, N. Y., a collection was being taken up to defray the expense of adding after the words, "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night," these two words "except Summerfield."

I know the House will reject the pending amendment and approve this amount of \$41 million and thus stop any further curtailment in postal service.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. MURRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I support the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee for \$41 million for the Post Office Department. I feel that this is nonpartisan, nonpolitical; and, certainly, politics regarding action of the Postmaster General in this matter should not be injected into it.

I know a little about the operation of the Post Office Department. I was with the Post Office Department for 11 years. I served with Generals Farley, Walker, and Hannegan and I have been on the Post Office Committee since January 1943.

I do not think the Postmaster General is due the unwarranted and unjust criticism that has been made of him today. Certainly he has done all he could to get this supplemental appropriation. He started last July telling the Bureau of the Budget that he had to have a supplemental appropriation. I cannot understand all this furor over this request. I regret the delay of the Bureau of the Budget in sending up the request for the supplemental appropriation but certainly the delay cannot be placed upon the Postmaster General.

As I have already said, the Post Office Department has been given supplemental appropriations for the last 10 years with the exception of 3 years when the present Postmaster General turned back substantial sums into the Treasury in 1953, 1954, and 1955 by not spending the full appropriations given him by Congress for these years.

The Post Office Department absolutely needs this money on which to operate during the rest of this quarter. You can either give the Post Office Department this money or you can expect drastic curtailment of your postal service from now until the first of July. The Postmaster General has no alternative.

All of you know that the mail volume increased considerably during the past year, that many expansions were made in the city carrier service and in rural route extensions. The volume of the mail demands for new city carrier routes exceeded the estimate of the Postmaster General when the budget was presented to Congress. Now the people are clamoring for good service. If you want good service, if you want to satisfy the patrons, and continue the efficient service of the Department, you will vote for this appropriation of \$41 million.

I do not agree that the Postmaster General is here trying to browbeat or sandbag the Congress. In my opinion he is doing the only thing possible in asking for the supplemental appropriation. He is telling us that he must have this money or that the service must be curtailed.

In my opinion, if you do not vote the Post Office Department the full \$41 million you will not only have your post offices closed every Saturday from now until the first of July, but you will also see many other drastic curtailments and reductions of the postal service. It must be so, because the Post Office Department just will not have the money to do otherwise if the appropriation of \$41 million is not made by Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain salient facts that are outstanding in this matter. Whatever difficulty there is about the budget message coming up, it is the fault of somebody in the administration. It is either the fault of the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, or the fault of the Director of the Budget. On the evidence submitted, I am inclined to think it is the Director of the Budget. We start out with the proposition that wherever the blame is, as far as the administration is concerned,

it rests somewhere in the Republican administration and not with the Committee on Appropriations.

There are certain facts we must face from the practical angle. The Committee on Appropriations last Friday voted \$41 million. Everybody knew that was voted out of the committee and anyone with commonsense knows that is going through. Postmaster General Summerfield, in my opinion, was not only in contempt or showed a contemptuous attitude toward the Congress, but he also showed a contemptuous attitude toward the people of America when with the knowledge that the Committee on Appropriations had voted out \$41 million last Friday he did not rescind his order for last Saturday at least. All of us know the history of the antideficiency law; all of us are acquainted with that law and everyone knows there has never been any prosecution under it or any action taken under it. Postmaster General Summerfield knew that and with knowledge of what the committee had done last Friday he owed it to the American people to keep the post offices throughout the country open. If he had stated at that time, in rescinding his order for last Saturday, that if he did not get this money by next Saturday the order would stand, there might have been some logic in that action. But he did not do that. When the committee had acted, I cannot see why he did not then rescind his order.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am majority leader of the House. Whether Postmaster General Summerfield consults with me or not is immaterial to me. Whether he has to might be a matter of discussion with some people. But it is the fact that so far as Speaker RAYBURN is concerned, he never saw the Postmaster General in connection with this matter until last Thursday, until after he had been doing all this talking through the press. I have not seen him. He has not even telephoned me. He would probably say he did not have to telephone me. But there is leadership up here. He has been up here consulting with the leadership of the Republican Party, and he should, but it seems to me as a matter of decency, if for no other reason, before he started talking and threatening through the press, and when the facts did not justify it, he should have come up here and talked with the leadership not on one side but with the leadership on both sides.

Let us push aside all of these things and get down to the real facts. To me the real issue here is the general public. What should we do in the interest of the general public? In the interest of the general public we should vote against the pending amendment that has been offered and vote for the \$41 million, get it through before we recess, and let the post offices of the country be opened during the remainder of this quarter.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should be carried away by alibis or excuses. The fact is Postmaster General Summerfield

last July knew there was going to be a deficit and he so informed the Congress. The fact is that later on he renewed his plea that he needed this money if the service was to continue. The fact is that a week ago he was here and implored those who had charge of the appropriations in this House that he needed this money and that he could not continue unless given that money. The fact is he postponed that closing order for a week in the hope that the Congress would see clearly its duty to the American people and provide the money that would permit the postal service to go on as usual.

Last Friday it was stated by a high-ranking Member of Congress that he had violated the law about spending money outside the budget. That was untrue; he had not done so. Now, I ask in all fairness, if you were the Postmaster General, would you violate a law that he had already been falsely accused of violating? Of course you would not. To do that would be to put himself in a trap that would be inexcusable. So I say to you, my friends, the Postmaster General is not to blame for this stopping of the mail no matter how many political protestations are made. We had a month to pass this appropriation bill in the House and we did not do it. I have been a Member of this House for a great many years. I have seen other bills in jeopardy, lacking a few hours of meeting payrolls. These went through this House by unanimous consent, because we recognized our obligation to the people who had earned the pay. True, no one before ever made any talk about the crime of exceeding the budget allowance. But here he was warned by members of the Appropriation Committee. One more thing I want to warn you of: There is a bill in conference, and has been in conference in for a long while, and unless you get it out pretty soon, the social-security people of this country will be right where the postal employees are now. Let us not have another failure of Congress to meet its obligations. I say, let us be fair. Let us give the Postmaster General the funds which are necessary to carry the mails. The people want the service and expect us to do it. I do not believe by raising a smokescreen that we are going to keep the people from knowing where is the real responsibility for the failure of the mails to go through. The people of America are not dumb and they are not easily fooled. They can judge for themselves, and I know they will. Let us quit quibbling and vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and pass this appropriation bill today so the services that the people are clamoring for can be resumed. You can have service only to the extent you are willing to pay for it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I want to take just a moment or two to point out the curtailment features of Postmaster General Summerfield's order.

I am surprised, yes, shocked that a member of the President's Cabinet would do what Postmaster General Summerfield has done. I am convinced that Summerfield's orders were not issued to actually obtain savings in the Post Office Department but were intended solely and simply to arouse the people into pressuring the Congress into appropriating additional money for the Post Office Department for the balance of this fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The action of the Postmaster General is deceiving to the American people. It was not an effort to bring the expenditures of the Post Office Department within the amount appropriated for the Department but rather it was intended to strike at the most important service of the Department that would be felt quicker by the people so as to get the desired reaction from them.

The orders prohibit the deliveries of RFD mail on Saturdays but it requires RFD carriers to put in full time on Saturdays with pay by sitting idly in their respective post offices. This deprived the RFD patrons of delivery of their Saturday's mail with no savings whatever to the Post Office Department except the small amount paid the carriers by way of mileage. This was plainly an effort to arouse the American people and to secure additional tax money for the Department. In my opinion, it amounts to extortion. It is an attempt on the part of Summerfield to hoodwink the American people into bludgeoning the Congress into giving the Post Office Department additional money to take the place of funds that have been unwisely and uneconomically spent heretofore by the Department contrary not only to the wishes of the Congress but the plain intent of the law.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to giving the Post Office Department any funds over and above the \$17 million recommended originally by the Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. To do otherwise would be an admission on the part of the Congress that they do not have the power, the foresight, or the wisdom to legislate on matters of vital importance to the people of America. To refuse the Post Office Department this blood money that Summerfield is now requesting may cause some inconvenience to our people. Suppose it does? It is better for us to suffer some inconvenience now than to wreck the economy of this country by inefficiency and fiscal irresponsibility on the part of arrogant bureaucrats who are unwilling to even try to economize and put their departments on an efficiency basis.

It is estimated that the Secretary's orders prohibiting the rural carriers

from delivering the Saturday's mail along their rural routes composing 1,582,800 miles will amount to only a savings of approximately \$142,000.

The so-called economy order in my opinion emanates from a fanatical desire to compel the Congress to yield to every whim and wish of an autocratic and dictatorial bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to giving the Post Office Department the funds that they are requesting, and I hope that our Congress, particularly this House, will see to it that we do the legislating, and that we do not yield on this occasion.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, the gentleman is saying that all of these men sat in the post office, got paid, but were not allowed to deliver the mail?

Mr. ABBITT. They were prohibited from delivering the mail. They required the rural carriers to go to the post office and sit inside, with the windows closed, in most of the rural offices, but were prohibited from receiving or delivering the mail.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If this House has the courage that the writers of the Constitution intended it to have, and that is not grounds for impeachment, then I do not know what is.

Mr. ABBITT. That is my information. And my information is that it is estimated that this would only save approximately \$142,000; yet the rural people of America were denied mail rural delivery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation resolves into a question of whether the House is willing to provide funds to pay the postal employees for their services and to provide the people of this country with mail service to which they are entitled.

The cause of the need for additional funds is by reason of postal services in additional areas and to an unprecedented volume of mail due to high business activity and increased cost resulting from postal employees' pay adjustments.

The impact of this need for additional funds was felt as long ago as last July. Most of the discussion revolved around the fact that a request for a deficiency appropriation should have been initiated when the first transfer of funds was made from the last quarter of this fiscal year to the first quarter of this fiscal year. This occurred last July. Requests for these funds were not submitted because the Bureau of the Budget did not clear them, which is required procedure.

Under the present circumstances, I believe that Congress must provide the additional funds. Certainly, we cannot

afford to let our postal service deteriorate. Business plans have been made relying on existing postal service. I have done, and intend to do everything possible to see that these services continue.

Much has been said with regard to the so-called violation of law. There is no charge or inference that there has been misuse of funds. It is a question of judgment as to the need of additional funds to carry out an expanded program. In any event, the question before us today is whether the users of the mail are to have the services to which they have been accustomed and to which they are entitled and whether you want to appropriate sufficient funds to pay for this service and to pay the postal employees who perform that service.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, if you could picture a business doing \$2½ billion a year, employing 373,338 full-time employees and 135,000 part-time employees, maintaining 39,000 district offices, I am sure you would classify this investment as big, big business.

I am also sure the board of directors in debating their choice of a new president, would very carefully weigh the qualifications of all prospective candidates for the position. Prime consideration in the selection would be given to a man's ability, knowledge, and experience in the business.

We in Government are running a business of this size for what I have described as the United States Post Offices.

Our post office was founded temporarily after the adoption of the Constitution in March of 1789. In 1829, the Postmaster General was made a member of the President's Cabinet by Andrew Jackson. In June of 1872, the Post Office Department became an executive department by an act of Congress. Our post-office system started with 75 post offices. Today, it is one of the largest businesses in the world.

Over the years the following motto was accepted by the postal employees as their incentive "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

A great pride has existed among the postal employees that they have never failed the motto under which they have worked.

For the first time since its inception, last weekend all post offices were closed.

The great record of services by the post offices was established by the postal employees.

These men through competitive examination had chosen the profession of a postal worker. As postal employees they took pride in seeing that the mail went through.

Their promotions in the post office were based on their ability, their experience, and by their standing in competitive tests.

In the previous administration under President Truman, the Postmaster General was a product of the post office system.

He had the esprit de corps of the service.

He believed in the postal motto. Every promotion he received was because of his knowledge and experience in handling the mail. When the former Postmaster General was appointed, he measured up to all the qualifications needed to fill the position.

He was selected in the same way that the board of directors of a private corporation would select a man to be president of their company.

By no stretch of the imagination can the breakdown of the post office of the last week-end be blamed on those dedicated employees who are proud to be a part of our great post-office system.

This great blow dealt to the prestige of our post office can be placed at the door of only one man—the President of the United States.

Mr. Eisenhower would not consider carrying out the policy set by his predecessor by appointing one from the ranks and who had long experience in post-office work.

Although Postmaster General Donaldson was thoroughly experienced and had made a great record, the Eisenhower administration turned their back not only on him but on the thousands of capable postal employees who knew thoroughly the workings of the post office, and made his selection under the spoils and patronage system.

The present administration chose the Postmaster General only on the following basis:

First, he was a Republican.

Second, he contributed to the Republican Party.

Third, he sold cars made by the General Motors Co.

Who among the members of the big business interests of Eisenhower's Cabinet would select a President of one of their holdings on the above basis?

Inefficiency, and waste of money in the post-office system have been the result of this bad appointment.

Bungling by the administration, in the affairs of the post office, has resulted in breaking the morale of those who have spent all their life as a postal employee.

I have been told by many employees that the check and doublecheck and experimental changes suggested by the present Postmaster General, have brought havoc and disorder to the regular procedure of the postal worker.

No wonder the Postmaster General is short \$47 million. The business administration the Postmaster General likes to speak about, if continued by him, will completely destroy our Post Office which we have all regarded with reverence over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that drastic steps must be taken by Congress.

I have introduced a resolution requesting the President to ask for the resignation of the Postmaster General and to designate an experienced official—one who has been an employee of the Post Office Department to replace him.

This man must have the ability, experience and knowledge of the problems of the postal service, and be well qualified to discharge his duties.

I believe that after this appointment is made there should be a thorough investigation of our greatly enlarged Post Office services so that proper changes to keep abreast of the times may be made.

The best one qualified to do this job is one who has worked in the postal service; who has secured his promotion—not under the spoils and patronage system—but on his qualifications, ability and experience to do a good job.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 6870, to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, line 7, strike out the words "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$19,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia) there were—ayes 12, noes 121.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend

their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

A SKIP-TRACING FIRM MASQUERADING AS UNCLE SAM

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, other Members have recently received from their constituents, as I have, official-looking forms from "Director in Charge, NRC Office, 748 Washington Building, Washington, D. C." labeled "NRC Office—Notice," asking for information about the recipient's occupation, employer, birthdate, social security number, and correct address. The form also contains printed symbols and boxes obviously intended to make the notification look official and governmental.

A Milwaukee constituent who recently received one of these forms through the mail has passed it on to me, inquiring whether this was an official governmental form.

Members will be interested that the agency which sends out these forms throughout the country is in no way connected with the Government, but is a "skip-tracing" firm which has been in trouble with the Federal Trade Commission before. It supplies printed forms for companies wishing to trace and obtain personal information concerning debtors. The "NRC" stands, it turns out, for "National Research Co." But a visit to the NRC office in the Washington Building disclosed that the NRC is unequipped to do any particular "research." Instead, the only person in the place, Lansing Joralemon, the director in charge, admitted that "our business is skip-tracing."

The FTC on June 1, 1956, ordered the NRC to cease and desist from using any forms intended to convey the false impression that the business was connected with the United States Government. Since then the company has stopped using eagles and the words "United States," but uses the present form, which is equally deceptive. The company's attorney, Murray M. Chotiner, as recently as February 23, 1957, told the FTC that he was going to keep right on using the present forms.

The Federal Government plagues its citizens with enough forms and reports as it is, without letting Mr. Chotiner's skip-tracing bureau add to the workload.

This kind of petty deception is thousands of years old. Smooth Jacob impersonated hairy Esau by covering his hand with animal skin and attempted to fool his father despite his slick voice. In this case, Mr. Chotiner is attempting to dress the NRC in the clothes of Uncle Sam. The hand may be the hand of Uncle Sam, but the voice is the voice of Chotiner.

I am hopeful that the Federal Trade Commission will take prompt action. Debt collecting is a legitimate business, but not when the collector seeks to make Uncle Sam the collecting agency. I include my letter of April 12, 1957, to the FTC:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1957.

Re National Research Co. et al., Docket 6236.
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I urge your honorable body immediately to take the strongest possible action to enforce your order of June 1, 1956, which directed the National Research Co. to stop the distribution of any forms or questionnaires calculated to convey the false impression to the recipient that the company was in any manner connected with the United States Government.

Despite your cease-and-desist order of last June 1, the National Research Co. has continued to distribute misleading forms designed to pursue and entrap defaulting debtors. This outfit has masqueraded as a Government agency long enough. I suggest that the Department of Justice be asked immediately to institute a civil penalty suit against the company.

I am enclosing copies of two documents received through the mail on or about March 27, 1957, by Mrs. Getty M. Tiedt, 1010 West Orchard Street, Milwaukee, Wis. The original documents are in my possession and can be used as evidence in a suit against the company when needed. The documents are:

1. An IBM-type form headed "NRC Office, 748 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Notice from 'Director in Charge, Lansing Joralemon,' to Mrs. Tiedt. The form makes "immediate request" for information concerning her occupation, employer, birth date, social-security number, and correct address. It contains other mumbo-jumbo intended to make the notification look official and governmental.

2. A business reply envelope for returning the form addressed to "NRC Office, Director in Charge, Lansing Joralemon, 748 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C."

Mrs. Tiedt filled out and dated the form March 27, 1957, and states that she received it not more than 1 or 2 days before that. Therefore this is clear evidence that the forms were distributed after your Commission by letter dated February 13, 1957, notified Mr. Murray M. Chotiner, attorney for the National Research Co., that the use of any forms that would not make the recipient aware that the information was sought in connection with the collection of a debt would be a violation of your order of June 1, 1956, and would result in a request to the Department of Justice to start a civil penalty action.

Your compliance division has informed me that Mr. Chotiner, who reportedly is not only the attorney for the National Research Co. but also a principal in the company, in a letter dated February 23, 1957, denied that there was deception in the form, denied that your order required the form to state that its purpose was to gain information about delinquent debtors, invited a test case and suggested that it be initiated in the Federal

Court of Southern California, his home territory.

Let's have the lawsuit. The courts have upheld similar orders of your Commission in the past. Certainly they will not permit companies to badger citizens under the guise of nonexistent governmental connections.

I should like to quote from the letter of the Milwaukee attorney who forwarded on to me the documents received by Mrs. Tiedt:

"Enclosed is something that gets my dander up. I suspect this is a collection outfit creating the impression that it is a Government agency. It is a dirty shame that a citizen's desire to cooperate with the Government should be exploited by shysters. Ultimately, if this abuse spreads, people will not cooperate with Government requests for information."

Your Commission by its order of June 1, 1956, did succeed in stopping the National Research Co. from using even more flagrantly fraudulent forms containing pictures of eagles and other symbols and phony titles to convey the impression of Government affiliation. The new form is an obvious attempt to sneak around the Commission's order. Until such forms or questionnaires state their true purpose on their face, making clear that they are not from a Government agency, their use should not be permitted.

I am sure that the Commission recognizes the dangers to the public interest and to the good name of the Government that are inherent in this kind of masquerading operation. I look forward to hearing from you that strong steps are being taken to stop this deceitful practice.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

FAIR PLAY IN CONGRESSIONAL BUSINESS

(Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention a story which appeared in the noon edition of the Washington Daily News of April 12, 1957, which story referred in detail to a number of allegations of misconduct of military personnel in Alaska, including several high-ranking officers of the Air Force. These allegations were reportedly contained in a letter addressed to me and signed by a "Keith Hart," who gave his address as College, Alaska.

Substantially the same story has appeared in local newspapers and in wire service stories given wide dissemination.

I am concerned about the only impression that can be drawn by the average reader from the Daily News version, and one or two others—and that is that the letter was made public or available to the press by my office or by the staff of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That impression is inaccurate—I did not release the letter to the press. The facts are these:

First. The original of the Hart letter was addressed to me and delivered to my office on April 10, 1957; the original letter I received indicated on its last page that carbon copies had gone to at least 14 other people, a number of them here in Washington. Upon receipt of the letter I contacted the appropriate officials in the Defense Department and asked that I be given an early reply to the allegations.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 17, 1957
For actions of April 16, 1957
85th-1st, No. 67

CONTENTS

Air conditioning.....1	Feed.....1	Postal service.....22
Appropriations.....1,5	Food additives.....26	Potatoes.....24
Automation.....19	Forestry.....7,12,15	Property.....6
Banking and currency....27	Fruits and vegetables..16	REA.....2
Budget.....12,17,23	International	Reclamation.....3,3,21
Buildings.....14	organizations.....1	Reports.....4
Conservation.....1	Lands.....7	Research.....6
Electrification.....2,9,20	Loans.....1	Soil bank.....18
Experiment stations.....6	Meat promotion.....11	Surplus commodities....13
Drought relief.....28	Monopolies.....1	Trade, foreign.....10,13
Farm program.....18	Personnel.....1	Wildlife.....25

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses cleared second urgent deficiency appropriation bill for President. President approved bill. House passed measure providing certain funds in first urgent deficiency appropriation bill pending enactment of that measure. House debated State-Justice appropriation bill. Senate passed bill to convey Midwest Claypan Research Station to U. of Mo. Sen. Morse discussed his formula requiring compensation for conveying Government property.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H.J. Res. 310 to provide funds for certain items in H.R. 4249, the first urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957, pending enactment of the latter bill, which is still in conference. The measure includes provision for emergency conservation measures, disaster loan revolving fund, and farm operating loans, except that no funds are provided for cotton seed feed under the emergency feed and seed assistance program as this point is still in disagreement in conference (H. Rept. 355) (pp. 5222-24, 5244). See Digests 19, 21, and 26 for provisions of H.R. 4249.

Began debate on H.R. 6871, the State, Justice, Judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 5188-5222, 5224-41). Agreed to, 76 to 59, an amendment by Rep. Gross to reduce the funds for contributions to international organizations from \$35,899,243 to \$28,859,285 (pp. 5226-27). Rejected amendments by Rep. Dowdy that the CCC be reimbursed \$3,575,000 for Public Law 480 foreign currency funds used for international educational exchange activities (pp. 5231-32), and by a vote of 23 to 67, \$1,350,000 for similar funds used by the USIA (p. 5238).

The bill includes funds for contributions to international organizations, including \$1,980,245 for the Food and Agriculture Organization, \$214,008 for the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, \$17,150 for the International Sugar Council, and \$24,666 for the International Wheat Council.

The committee report includes statements as follows:

International organizations. "For the past several years now, the Committee has expressed its concern over the ever increasing amounts required for this item. It recognizes that a portion of the increase is due to the enactment of laws authorizing larger contributions. However, the Department of State is expected to make every effort to hold these contributions to the absolute minimum required.

"In its report last year the Committee pointed out that the number of American personnel on the payroll of the various international organizations to which we contribute is in most cases entirely inadequate in comparison with the amount we contribute. An examination of the hearings of the Committee in this regard will disclose that this situation is no better than it was a year ago."

Monopolies. "The Committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$3,785,000 for expenses necessary for enforcement of anti-trust and kindred laws...In recommending the full amount of the budget estimate, the Committee expects that a vigorous and effective program of enforcement of the antitrust laws will be carried out."

Air conditioning. "The request for \$1,500,000 additional for air conditioning has been disallowed...The Committee is still in agreement with the position taken last year by the General Services Administration that piecemeal air conditioning cannot be economically supported when compared to a program of air conditioning complete buildings and tends to generate numerous further requests to air condition space of other Government occupants in the building."

"Annualization of personnel positions. The committee report went into considerable detail on this subject and included the following: "The Committee has not only disallowed the funds requested for the 2123 new positions, but it has also disallowed the funds for 'annualizing' the 950 positions established during the current fiscal year without prior consideration or appropriations therefor by the Congress.

"If in the future justifications are presented to this Committee containing requests for so-called 'annualization' of positions not previously considered and appropriated for by the Congress, they will be rejected and returned to the Department or Agency. Such attempts contribute nothing toward good budgeting procedures and are not in keeping with the practices to be expected of responsible public officials.

2. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Cannon discussed the Atomic Energy Commission program relative to civilian reactor activities for the development of electric power, including references to the activities of REA coops in this field. pp. 5188-5200
3. RECLAMATION. Received from the Interior Department a report on the Mercedes Division of the Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Tex., pursuant to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Doc. 152). p. 5244
4. ANNUAL REPORTS. Received the 1956 annual report of the Attorney General on the activities of the Justice Department. p. 5244

SENATE

5. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6870, the second urgent deficiency bill, 1957. The Appropriations Committee earlier reported the bill (S. Rept. 234) with amendments to include contingent expenses of the Senate, which were adopted. Sen. Goldwater stated his opposition to passage of the bill and urged reduced spending by Government agencies. pp. 5115-17

The House then agreed to the Senate amendments to the bill (p. 5222). This bill was then sent to and approved by the President yesterday, Apr. 16. (For provisions of interest to this Department, see Digests 65 and 66.)

6. PROPERTY. Passed with amendment S. 1034, to transfer the Midwest Claypan Research Station to the U. of Mo.. Agreed to Sen. Symington's amendment to leave the conditions to the Secretary and reserve to the U.S. the mineral rights. pp. 5143-9
Sen. Morse explained his formula regarding his objections to conveyance of Federal property without compensation of at least 50% of the market value if given to a local government agency for public use, and 100% if for a private use. He inserted a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning S. 1529, authorizing that Department to convey an agricultural experiment station in Klamath Falls, Ore., to Klamath County. He agreed with Sen. Carroll that Federal grants-in-aid to State corporations might lead the Morse formula not to apply. pp. 5153-6
7. LANDS. Received from this Department and the Army notice of intention of the departments to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands. p. 5117
Sen. Carlson inserted resolutions of the Kans. House and ten American Legion posts criticizing the land procurement policies of the Corps of Engineers in the Tuttle Creek Dam area. pp. 5120-1
8. RECLAMATION. Received from the Department of the Interior a report on the San Angelo project, Tex.. p. 5117
Passed with amendments S. J. Res. 12, to transfer the right-of-way for Yellowtail dam and reservoir. pp. 5138-48
9. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from the Interior Department a proposed contract with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company for transmission and exchange services. p. 5117
Sen. Kefauver criticized the privately owned power and light companies for advertisements attacking public power, and inserted a letter from the Internal Revenue Service concerning the deductibility of such advertising costs from the income tax. pp. 5137-8
10. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a Penna. Senate resolution urging more adequate safeguards against foreign imports such as the quota system protecting certain farm products. pp. 5117-18
Sen. Malone inserted Nev. Legislature and other organizations' resolutions urging an end to the trade agreements program, and editorials supporting this stand. pp. 5167-73
11. MEAT PROMOTION. Sen. Hennings inserted a Mo. Livestock Ass'n resolution opposing S. 646, to establish a self-help meat promotion program, and asking that it be deferred. He also inserted a letter from the group's President stating that, since the present program was effective, the proposal might increase costs without additional value. pp. 5121-2
12. BUDGET. Sen. Morse criticized the Department for proposing to absorb the Forest Service 1957 fire-fighting costs from other programs, while presenting a 1958 budget that increased all such programs (pp. 5158-9). He inserted an editorial claiming there is a contrast between the President's budget promises in 1952 with the 1958 budget. He urged Congress to be the final judge on how funds are expended, and to stop allowing the transfer of funds from one

program to another. He discussed the necessity of the Upper Colorado River project with Sen. Souglas, defending it as an investment in water conservation. pp. 5157-61

13. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Subcommittee on Housing, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in its "Review of Military Housing Programs," (S. Rept. 231) comments that "Foreign currencies made available through the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities provide today the most advantageous means of financing overseas housing." The Report discusses the advantages of Public Laws 161 and 968, 84th Congress, which allowed the construction of housing with currencies generated through any disposal transaction, even though the country in which the Housing is to be built does not buy our surplus commodities.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. BUILDINGS. Sen. Magnuson criticized the administration's "unworkable" lease-purchase program for federal buildings and inserted an editorial, "Lease, Purchase, and Lose," on this subject. p. A2999
15. FORESTS. Sen. Kefauver inserted an editorial describing the Mission 66 program designed to preserve our national parks in their natural state, and to provide more adequate facilities to take care of the growing number of visitors each year. p. A2999
16. FRUITS AND VEGETABLES. Sen. Neuberger inserted a Hood River Oreg. Chamber of Commerce release giving details of an awards dinner for such categories as horticulture, orchard management, orchard soil management, and citizenship. p. A3001
17. BUDGET. Sen. Hennings inserted an editorial, "Difficult, Perilous Task," discussing some of the problems facing Congress in reducing the President's budget. p. A3002
Rep. Hemphill inserted an editorial criticizing the budget and stating that the people want to know why Federal expenditures can no longer be controlled. p. A3007
Extension of remarks of Rep. Neal stating that big reductions in the budget, the ones that really count, can come only through a judicious reappraisal of our commitments for national defense and foreign economic aid. p. A3011
18. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Brown inserted a speech delivered by J. W. Fanning, division of agricultural economics, University of Ga., "Looking Ahead in Southern Agriculture." pp. A3005-6
Rep. Bentley inserted a press release regarding the results of an annual congressional poll taken among his constituents, including votes by farmers on the soil bank program, price supports, etc. p. A3015
19. AUTOMATION. Rep. Sheehan commended and inserted a recent address as "an understandable and informative discussion of the much-misunderstood project of automation." pp. A3010-1
20. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Ullman inserted a bulletin discussing the administration's position with regard to the Hells Canyon stretch on the Snake River and stating that the FPC "submissively" supports this position. pp. A3019-20
Rep. Laird inserted a Wisc. State Legislature resolution H.R. 742, relating to the improvement of the upper Fox River in Wisc. pp. A3020-1

Calendar No. 248

85TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
No. 234

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

APRIL 16, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6870]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House..... \$48, 990, 000

Amount of increase by Senate committee..... +871, 000

Amount of bill as reported to Senate..... 49, 861, 000

Amount of Budget estimates..... 55, 100, 000

Under Budget estimates..... -5, 239, 000

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-) Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
I	Agriculture.....	¹ (\$200, 950, 000)	¹ (\$200, 950, 000)	¹ (\$200, 950, 000)	-----	-----
II	Commerce.....	² 1, 000, 000	² 900, 000	² 900, 000	-\$100, 000	-----
III	Interior (Forest Service).....	³ 5, 000, 000	³ 5, 000, 000	³ 5, 000, 000	-----	-----
IV	Justice.....	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000	-----	-----
V	Health, Education, and Welfare.....	⁴ 1, 500, 000	⁴ 1, 500, 000	⁴ 1, 500, 000	-----	-----
VI	Post Office.....	47, 000, 000	41, 000, 000	41, 000, 000	-6, 000, 000	-----
VII	Legislative.....	300, 000	290, 000	1, 161, 000	+861, 000	+\$871, 000
	Total.....	55, 100, 000	48, 990, 000	49, 861, 000	-5, 239, 000	+871, 000

¹ Loan authorization of \$200,000,000 and transfer of \$950,000.

² In addition, \$250,000,000 payable from highway trust fund.

³ In addition, \$1,500,000 to be derived by transfer.

⁴ In addition, \$24,500,000 payable from OASI trust fund.

The committee concurs in the action of the House in the appropriations and loan authorizations recommended for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Forest Service, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. With reference to the Post Office Department, the supplemental budget estimate is in the amount of \$47 million. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended an appropriation of \$41 million or a reduction of \$6 million in the budget estimate. The House in passing the bill on April 15, 1957, agreed with the action of the House committee. The committee concurs in the action of the House in recommending an appropriation of \$41 million.

For the legislative branch, the committee recommends total appropriations of \$871,000 for the Senate and \$290,000 for the House. The details of the Senate items are described in the report.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The committee has allowed an additional sum for clerical assistance to the Vice President in the amount of \$5,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

The committee recommends that the following paragraphs making provision for additional clerical assistants to each of the Senators from the States of Louisiana, Ohio, and Texas be added to the bill:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over three million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over nine million, the population of said State having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$8,000.

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over nine million, the population of said State having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$2,000.

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

The committee recommends an additional amount of \$25,000 for the fiscal year 1956, and the sum of \$820,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year 1957.

AUTOMOBILES FOR THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

The following paragraphs are recommended for inclusion in the bill:

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$2,000.

Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$4,000.

Annual trade-ins for the vehicles referred to would require approximately \$3,500 per vehicle, which added to the salary of chauffeur and operation and maintenance would require an annual appropriation of \$10,600, or a total of \$21,200 for a 2-year period.

Biannual exchanges would require approximately \$5,500 in each odd numbered year. The appropriation required to trade-in biannually, including the salary of chauffeur and operation and maintenance, would be \$12,600 in the odd numbered year and \$7,100 in the even numbered year, or a combined total of \$19,700 for the 2 years.

By making biannual exchanges a saving of \$1,500 on each vehicle over the 2-year period will result.

The above amendments will permit the trade-in of vehicles during the odd-numbered year (1957). If this is done the estimates for the fiscal year 1958 can be reduced from \$9,125 to \$7,125 to compensate for the funds made available in this bill.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

*Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.
For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee.*

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
115	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE					
115	Plant and animal disease and pest control ¹ -----	(\$950, 000)	(\$950, 000)	(\$950, 000)		
	RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION					
115	Loan authorizations ² -----	(200, 000, 000)	(200, 000, 000)	(200, 000, 000)		
	Total, chapter I-----	(200, 950, 000)	(200, 950, 000)	(200, 950, 000)		
115	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
	BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS					
115	Federal-aid highways (trust fund)-----	(250, 000, 000)	(250, 000, 000)	(250, 000, 000)		
	Public-lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	1, 000, 000	900, 000	900, 000	-\$100, 000	
115	Total, chapter II-----	1, 000, 000	900, 000	900, 000	-100, 000	

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
FOREST SERVICE				
SALARIES AND EXPENSES				
115	Fighting forest fires-----	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
		³ (1, 500, 000)	³ (1, 500, 000)	³ (1, 500, 000)
	Total, chapter III-----	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
115	Fees and expenses of witnesses-----	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION				
115	Grants to States and other agencies-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
115	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance-----	[24, 500, 000]	[24, 500, 000]	[24, 500, 000]
	Total, chapter V-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000

¹ Transfer of \$950,000 from appropriations for fiscal year 1957 available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses.
² Budget estimates proposed as transfer from farm housing loan authorization contained in Housing Act of 1956. Carried in bill as separate loan authorization with transfer provision deleted.
³ To be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants).

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (–) Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
115	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
	Operations.....	\$47, 000, 000	\$41, 000, 000	\$41, 000, 000	–\$6, 000, 000	-----
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
	SENATE					
	Office of the Vice President.....			5, 000	+5, 000	+\$5, 000
	Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators.....			10, 000	+10, 000	+10, 000
	Inquiries and investigations, 1956.....			25, 000	+25, 000	+25, 000
	Inquiries and investigations, 1957.....			820, 000	+820, 000	+820, 000
	Automobile for President pro tempore.....			2, 000	+2, 000	+2, 000
	Automobiles for majority and minority leaders.....			4, 000	+4, 000	+4, 000
	Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.....			5, 000	+5, 000	+5, 000
	Total, Senate.....			871, 000	+871, 000	+871, 000

Calendar No. 248

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

[Report No. 234]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 16, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 16, 1957

Reported by Mr. HAYDEN, with amendments

[Insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply
5 appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Urgent
6 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", for plant and animal disease and pest control, not to exceed \$950,000, to be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants) : *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), and the Act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148), to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways (trust fund)", to remain available until expended, not more than \$250,000,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT

AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)", to remain available until expended, \$900,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Fighting forest fires", \$5,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of

1 Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such ap-
2 propriations which include funds for grants).

3 CHAPTER IV

4 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

5 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

6 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

7 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
8 witnesses", \$300,000.

9 CHAPTER V

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
11 WELFARE

12 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

13 GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

14 For an additional amount for "Grants to States and
15 other agencies", for vocational rehabilitation services under
16 section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended,
17 \$1,500,000.

18 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

20 SURVIVORS INSURANCE

21 The amount authorized by the Department of Health,
22 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957, to be
23 expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
24 trust fund for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age

1 and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$97,000,000"
2 to "\$121,500,000".

3 CHAPTER VI

4 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

5 (Out of postal fund)

6 OPERATIONS

7 For an additional amount for "Operations", \$41,000,000.

8 CHAPTER VII

9 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

10 SENATE

11 SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

12 *Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount*
13 *for clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$5,000.*

14 *Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For*
15 *an additional amount for administrative and clerical assist-*
16 *ants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assist-*
17 *ants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio*
18 *so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of*
19 *Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States*
20 *having a population of over three million, the population of*
21 *said State having exceeded three million inhabitants, and so*
22 *that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio*
23 *will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a*
24 *population of over nine million, the population of said State*
25 *having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$8,000.*

1 *Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators:*
 2 *For an additional amount for administrative and clerical*
 3 *assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assist-*
 4 *ants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the*
 5 *allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to*
 6 *that allowed Senators from States having a population of*
 7 *over nine million, the population of said State having ex-*
 8 *ceeded nine million inhabitants, \$2,000.*

9 *CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE*

10 *Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
 11 *for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956,*
 12 *\$25,000.*

13 *Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
 14 *for expenses of inquiries and investigations, \$820,000.*

15 *Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an addi-*
 16 *tional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance,*
 17 *and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore*
 18 *of the Senate, \$2,000.*

19 *Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For*
 20 *an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, main-*
 21 *tenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the*
 22 *majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority*
 23 *leader of the Senate, \$4,000.*

24 *Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administra-*
 25 *tion: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on*

1 *Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain*
2 *available during the existence of the committee.*

3 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

5 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

6 For an additional amount for "Special and Select Com-
7 mittees", \$290,000.

Passed the House of Representatives April 15, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

[Report No. 234]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

APRIL 16, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 16, 1957

Reported with amendments

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 16, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply
5 appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Urgent
6 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", for plant and animal disease and pest control, not to exceed \$950,000, to be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants) : *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), and the Act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148), to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for “Federal-aid highways (trust fund)”, to remain available until expended, not more than \$250,000,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT

AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for “Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)”, to remain available until expended, \$900,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Fighting forest fires”, \$5,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of

1 Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such ap-
2 propriations which include funds for grants).

3 CHAPTER IV

4 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

5 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

6 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

7 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
8 witnesses", \$300,000.

9 CHAPTER V

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

11 WELFARE

12 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

13 GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

14 For an additional amount for "Grants to States and
15 other agencies", for vocational rehabilitation services under
16 section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended,
17 \$1,500,000.

18 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

20 SURVIVORS INSURANCE

21 The amount authorized by the Department of Health,
22 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957, to be
23 expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
24 trust fund for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age

1 and Survivors Insurance”, is increased from “\$97,000,000”
2 to “\$121,500,000”.

3 CHAPTER VI

4 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

5 (Out of postal fund)

6 OPERATIONS

7 For an additional amount for “Operations”, \$41,000,000.

8 CHAPTER VII

9 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

10 (1) SENATE

11 (2) SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

12 (3) *Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount*
13 *for clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$5,000.*

14 (4) *Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For*
15 *an additional amount for administrative and clerical assist-*
16 *ants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assist-*
17 *ants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio*
18 *so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of*
19 *Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States*
20 *having a population of over three million, the population of*
21 *said State having exceeded three million inhabitants, and so*
22 *that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio*
23 *will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a*
24 *population of over nine million, the population of said State*
25 *having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$8,000.*

1 **(5)***Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators:*
2 *For an additional amount for administrative and clerical*
3 *assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assist-*
4 *ants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the*
5 *allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to*
6 *that allowed Senators from States having a population of*
7 *over nine million, the population of said State having ex-*
8 *ceeded nine million inhabitants, \$2,000.*

9 **(6)***CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE*

10 **(7)***Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
11 *for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956,*
12 *\$25,000.*

13 **(8)***Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
14 *for expenses of inquiries and investigations, \$820,000.*

15 **(9)***Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an addi-*
16 *tional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance,*
17 *and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore*
18 *of the Senate, \$2,000.*

19 **(10)***Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For*
20 *an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, main-*
21 *tenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the*
22 *majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority*
23 *leader of the Senate, \$4,000.*

24 **(11)***Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administra-*
25 *tion: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on*

1 *Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain*
2 *available during the existence of the committee.*

3 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

5 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

6 For an additional amount for "Special and Select Com-
7 mittees", \$290,000.

Passed the House of Representatives April 15, 1957.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments April 16, 1957.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6870

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 16, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 103

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1957

No. 67

Senate

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, all that we think or plan or do this sacred week has upon it the shadow of a rugged cross. With a surety that pure reason cannot follow, because it passeth understanding, we are conscious that in the face of man's best man, love's best love, as He moves with unshrinking, steady pace to the cross-crowned hill outside the city's walls, is the confirmation of our highest aspirations, the rebuke to our failure to be true to our best, the shining goal of a self uncowed by the threats of foes or compromised by the seduction of friends:

We take, O cross, thy shadow
For our abiding place,
We ask no other sunshine
Than the sunshine of His face;
Content to let the world go by,
To know no gain or loss,
Our sinful selves our only shame,
Our glory all the cross.

In His name, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross and despised the shame. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 15, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Duk Chang Cho;
S. 87. An act for the relief of Pavel Blaho;
S. 91. An act for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt;

S. 127. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;
S. 158. An act for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey;
S. 288. An act for the relief of Esther Guagliardo;
S. 363. An act for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang;
S. 424. An act for the relief of Herbert James Bramley;
S. 649. An act for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming and Yee Chung Nom Ming;
S. 753. An act for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New; and
S. 812. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;
S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Carlis Stender;
S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; and
S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ashun Yung.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1045. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;
H. R. 1983. An act to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes;
H. R. 3367. An act to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors;

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;
H. R. 4144. An act to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general or major general;

H. R. 5832. An act to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; and

Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; and

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1045. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 1983. An act to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3367. An act to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors; and

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4144. An act to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general or major general; and

H. R. 5832. An act to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 234)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report House bill 6870, making urgent deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, House bill 6870 has been reported to the Senate without change, insofar as the action taken by the House of Representatives on the appropriations for the executive branch is concerned. All the departments and agencies affected by the bill have been consulted, and they are fairly well satisfied with the amounts of appropriations voted by the House of Representatives.

The only amendments which have been made by the Senate committee in the bill provide for certain contingent expenses of the Senate; and the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in that connection corresponds in principle with the action taken by the House in making available the amount of \$290,000 "for 'Special and select committees.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was on page 5, beginning in line 10, after the heading "Legislative Branch," to insert "Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 10, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 3 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so

that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, \$820,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 14, to insert:

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of 2 automobiles, 1 for the majority leader of the Senate, and 1 for the minority leader of the Senate, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 23, to insert:

Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6870) was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate just passed the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was absent from the floor, on committee business, when the appropriation bill including the deficiency item for the Post Office Department passed the Senate. I had certainly expected that the bill would receive far more attention than that which was accorded to it this afternoon. I was very hopeful that we would have an opportunity to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of the passage of the measure. If such a vote had been

taken, I would have voted against the bill.

I think the statement made on yesterday by the Postmaster General—namely, that \$1 million was saved by closing the post offices last Saturday—indicates to the American people that \$52 million might be knocked from the budget this year by continuing to close the post offices on Saturday. The country is working on a 5-day week basis. I do not know why it is necessary for mail to be delivered on Saturday. In fact, last Saturday at home was a joy: I did not have to read any local newspapers; I received no bills; I received no letters from anyone telling me what an unusual person I am—in either direction. [Laughter.]

I think the country might welcome a respite from the free mailings which are so numerous, both those from the Congress and those emanating from private sources through the allowances of the law and the regulations of the Post Office Department.

I certainly would have hoped this body would have given more attention than it did to an item of approximately \$41 million.

However, inasmuch as the bill has now been passed, and inasmuch as I—because of my absence on committee business—did not have an opportunity to vote on the question of the passage of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the few words I have had to say on the bill be printed in the Record in connection with the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is one of the Nation's most outstanding advocates of economy, is not in favor of the position taken by the Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, in respect to this particular matter?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know what his final position is; he has taken several. However, when the Postmaster General said he could save money by not delivering mail on Saturday, I was in complete agreement with him. After the Postmaster General stated that \$1 million could be saved by not delivering mail on one Saturday, I do not know what happened to change his mind and to cause him to conclude that it would be necessary that the mail be delivered on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I was disturbed that, under coercion, the House caved in and voted to give the Postmaster General the amount of money he requested, because certainly he must have been in violation of some law, if the General Accounting Office was correct in its statement that the action of the Postmaster General was in violation of the law. He did not notify the Congress of the fact that he would be faced with a deficit. He notified Congress only at the last minute, and he used coercion and threats; and he seemed to

get away with it. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Arizona is not in accord with the attitude of the present Postmaster General.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if what the distinguished Senator from Montana says is true—and I have no reason to doubt its truthfulness—I certainly shall have reason to take issue with the Postmaster General.

I say to the Senator from Montana and to all other Senators that all of us are violating a law—one of the immutable laws of economics, namely, that one cannot spend what he does not have. However, today the Government is spending \$286 billion of the money of our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren and our great-great-grandchildren, as well as the money of the grandchildren's mothers. I say it is time we put a stop to it, even in the case of those who like to be bothered by having mail delivered on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from Arizona; and I wish to state that I hope the agencies downtown will take heed of what the Senator from Arizona has said.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I still have hope.

REQUESTED AUTHORIZATION FOR OUT-OF-TOWN HEARINGS BY JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be permitted to hold out-of-town hearings during the sessions of the Senate on May 7, 8, and 9, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must object to the request that the Senate authorize the subcommittee to hold out-of-town hearings. It is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. We have had difficulty in getting the committee to have a quorum present and to take action on the proposed civil-rights legislation, which now has been pending before that committee for some time.

In view of the fact that the Senate is about to take a recess for the Easter period, unless the subcommittee's out-of-town meetings could be held during that recess week, I must object to out-of-town meetings by any subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, until the full committee has at least acted on the proposed civil-rights legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senate is meeting today following an adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the month of March there were no significant developments relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF MILITARY AND NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts, for the period July 1, 1956, through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the San Angelo project, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENT TO CONTRACT WITH PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed contract entitled "Supplement to Contract With Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for Transmission and Exchange Service," dated March 1, 1957, amended March 4, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the development and modernization of the national system of navigation and traffic control facilities to serve present and future needs of civil and military aviation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MADAME HENRIETTE BUAILLON AND STANLEY JAMES CARPENTER

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Madame Henriette Buillon and Stanley James Carpenter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CARE AND TREATMENT OF INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the care and treatment of Indians, subsequent to June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the appropriation of funds for the construction of a fish-producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon, north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GOLDWATER on April 15, 1957, p. 5052, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"The increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability.

"The lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment.

"Our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto lest we become insolvent.

"Unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which represented 3.43 times the average of 45 million barrels imported in 1946, to approximately 154 million barrels in 1956, or the yearly equivalent of 36,640,000 tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass, and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass and other building supplies; lace, carpets, and all kinds of woolen, cotton, and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks, and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fasteners; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys; mushrooms; farm, dairy and dried milk products; wallpaper; hats and millinery; printing industry products; ladies' hand bags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts and nuts, and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated.

"Agricultural products, such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese, and peanuts enjoy the protection of import quotas.

"A maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it.

"Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide adequate safeguards in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas and an effective prohibition against dumping of imports in the United States; against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition, and that the

existing trade-agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators Paul L. Wagner, Ernest F. Walker, Arthur E. Kromer, William Z. Scott, Charles R. Mallory, J. Irving Whalley, Harold E. Flack, and John T. Van Sant, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 19th day of March 1957, and concurred in by the House of Representatives the 27th day of March 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,

"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to resist the efforts of proponents of centralization of government to invade the field of education and usurp or encroach upon the right and duty of the people in the local communities to provide for and supervise the education of their children

"Whereas the matter of education of the children of this State is now, and always has been of utmost concern to our citizens, both individually and collectively, and they have never hesitated to provide funds through taxation and otherwise in sufficient amount, both locally and statewide, to meet their obligation to provide proper educational facilities; and

"Whereas the differential that existed between construction and/or staffing of education facilities and student population arose through no fault or lack of interest of the people but was caused by wartime stresses and conditions when all peacetime construction and career planning, of necessity, was deferred in order that a maximum war effort could be put forth; and

"Whereas through thoughtful planning and economical and efficient use of available financial resources this State, and the local communities therein, have at this time, for all practical purposes, achieved an equalization between school facilities and school population without sacrificing quality of school plants or personnel, and, further, the office of superintendent of public instruction of this State, in cooperation with local school authorities has instituted an education-planning program so as to provide properly for the future population growth; and

"Whereas in recent years, through the efforts of certain national groups there has developed a strong movement to have the Federal Government step into or invade the education field on the pretext that the State and local authorities are unable to cope with the school problem, whereas the real reason therefor is to remove the whole field of education from the supervision, operation and control of the people of the local communities; and

"Whereas any such movement is objectionable upon several grounds among which are:

"(a) Any Federal program must be regulated which, in turn, calls for creation, establishment and staffing of various boards and bureaus with the usual waste, inefficiency, and consequent dissipation of badly needed tax money attendant thereon;

"(b) Apart from financial or economic consideration is the even greater danger that such movement could and, eventually, would

remove from the observation and control of the people of local communities the teaching methods, philosophy, source material and like matters, thus paving the way for subtle insinuation of the teachings of subversive ideologies into school curricula, and resulting in the possible warping, twisting and poisoning of the impressionable minds of children against our democratic principles and processes; and

"Whereas since the very inception of this program of unwarranted attempted usurpation of these inalienable rights and duties of the people, the State of South Dakota has fought it militantly and unyieldingly, as a result of which the aforesaid national groups have intentionally, knowingly, and unconsciously issued reports containing absolutely false misstatements and discolorations of fact and truth concerning this State's educational facilities and program in an insidious attempt to discredit, embarrass and belittle it and its citizens before the Congress of the United States and the people of this country; and

"Whereas such action upon the part of said national groups strengthens and confirms our suspicions that the tears they shed for the educational welfare of the children of this State and Nation are, truly, 'crocodile' in nature and serve but to camouflage the ulterior socialistic motives they so poorly conceal; and

"Whereas the aforesaid distortions and untruths by said groups concerning the situation in the State of South Dakota lead but to the conclusion that statements concerning the educational facilities and programs in other States are equally erroneous and fallacious; and

"Whereas this State, and the citizens hereof, are now, always have been, and always shall be unequivocally, incontrovertibly and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota,

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which, money would be appropriated and made available to the States, through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following:

"1. The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President.

"2. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"3. All representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"4. The governors of all other States of these United States.

"5. The commissioner on interstate cooperation in each of the other 47 States.

"L. R. HOUCK, President.

"NIELS P. JENSEN, Secretary."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the purpose of increasing the span of the Fore River Bridge in the city of Quincy

"Whereas navigation on Fore River in the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth

has increased both in the number and the size of vessels which must pass over these waters due to the shipyards and other defense and industrial plants which are located in the area; and

"Whereas the present span of the Fore River Bridge over said river is becoming inadequate to allow the free passage of shipping due to said increase in both the number and size of vessels which must pass thereunder; and

"Whereas it is important to both the national defense and the civilian economy and convenience that free and unimpeded access to the shipyards and industrial plants in said area be available for both naval and civilian ships: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate funds authorizing the widening of the span of the Fore River Bridge in the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, April 3, 1957.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, Clerk.

"A true copy, attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works:

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress regarding the diversion of water from the Great Lakes

"Whereas the city of Chicago and its suburbs attempted, prior to 1900, to dispose of their sewage by digging the Chicago Sanitary Canal across the Continental Divide and diverting water from Lake Michigan to discharge the sewage into the Mississippi watershed; and

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court restrained this diversion in 1930 and required the area to develop other means of sewage disposal, but since then a veritable parade of other reasons for directing water from the Great Lakes have been proposed, including the desire to reduce the salty content of the lower Mississippi by diverting water from Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the program of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin is rapidly shaping up into a plan which will enhance the economic life of that area; and

"Whereas the persistent efforts of the advocates of diversion to make inroads into the Great Lakes water supply are disrupting and in fact nullifying any long-range plan for the development of the waterways of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court has provided an equitable plan for the allocation of the waters of the Great Lakes which is subject to modification whenever the advocates of diversion can provide the necessary data to cause the court to modify its order of 1930 and 1956; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be and it hereby is petitioned to refrain from disrupting the longstanding order of the Supreme Court because—

"1. The authorization of increased diversions of waters from the Great Lakes must of necessity affect the development of lake ports and lake shipping adversely;

"2. The issue which involves engineering decisions and international considerations should be made by means of the judicial process; and

"3. The valuable resources contained in the waters of the Great Lakes ought not to

posed to carry out the will of Congress and the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know; but what I mean is this: Here is another illustration, "Salary of the United States Member." Let us assume that a Member of the House wanted to cut that particular item out, cut out that salary. How could he draw the amendment? If the amendment is offered in the way the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to cut the \$93 million, that does not mean that that particular item would be taken out even if the amendment were approved, does it?

Mr. ROONEY. That would be a question of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The agency could state the salary—leave out some other item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. Many here have said that the members of this subcommittee have done a good job in unearthing the facts. We worked for practically 2 months on this bill, every day from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 or 4:30 in the afternoon 5 days a week. We think we have cut the fat out of it. We think we have taken away as much as we can safely take away. Now along comes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] who wants to reduce it further by \$2 million. The gentleman has the printed committee hearings. I know he has carefully studied them. He has had these hearings for over a week. Now he appears to be qualifying as a better expert than any of the members of the subcommittee. The gentleman is now in a dangerous area when he proposes to further cut salaries and expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Honestly, this is a very, very dangerous area. I think the House will accept the judgment of the committee in preference to the judgment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Each year the gentleman from Iowa offers these kinds of amendments and he bases them on the very facts developed by the committee and which the committee used to make the committee cut. I respectfully suggest to the membership of the House that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not think the chairman of the subcommittee should be so wrought up about anybody offering amendments. My good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] and his committee spent weeks and weeks in hearings on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The economy bloc, that is not here today, was on the floor in full force that day offering all kinds of amendments to cut appropriations on the health, education, and welfare bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech; I yielded for a question.

Mr. GAVIN. I know, but I just say the gentleman should not be concerned—

Mr. ROONEY. Let the gentleman obtain his own speech time. If I have another breath or two left later, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I want to finish this thought first.

The committee was asked for \$112 million for this item of salaries and expenses. It covers the actual running of the State Department personnel, all their equipment, transportation, and other necessary expenses. The committee cut this request to \$93,088,500. The committee allowed the exact amount they have at the present time plus \$2,588,500, which is for retirement-fund contributions.

Mr. GAVIN. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROONEY. For a brief question; not a speech.

Mr. GAVIN. I am just weeping—

Mr. ROONEY. What is the distinguished gentleman weeping about?

Mr. GAVIN. I am weeping for that \$16,000-a-year executive, the gentleman brought to our attention very dramatically a few moments ago.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean the publicity man who had to spend a little money out of his own pocket?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; that gentleman from Baghdad, who got his salary increased from \$3,900 to \$16,000. I just feel quite bad about it.

Mr. ROONEY. I will lend the gentleman my handkerchief if he saturates his. But let us not laugh about this pending amendment. This is the most important item in the bill. This is just as important as the Federal Bureau of Investigation money contained in this bill. Do not ruin the American Foreign Service.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania should save his tears, because the fellow he is talking about is not in this part of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. If this amendment is carried, you would have to dismiss people who are at present serving in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. It would create utter chaos in the State Department. The action I say would be irresponsible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree, I am sure, that there are some of those people in this part of the bill, too?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I do not think so. I am being utterly honest with the House. I am afraid of the consequences of this amendment. I think it would be irresponsible to cut this any further than the committee did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross), there were—ayes 31, noes 76

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$600,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 4, line 13, strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$400,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, do close in 15 minutes with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the best and most forceful statement in favor of this amendment has been made by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York. He described the situation rather clearly, I think, a while ago. He said he differs in the point of view in respect to the subject matter. He did tell you quite plainly, as I see it, why the proposed amount in this bill should be reduced. I want to commend him, for having reduced the request as much as he did. This thing had gone wild. The request was \$1,200,000 and he secured approval of his committee in the sum of \$600,000. I want to remind you, too, that this is not the only item of so-called representation in this legislation. This is one of the items. So if you only support this amendment, you will then be cutting it back to where it was in 1956, 1954, 1953, and 1952. I am asking for a reduction in line, where it was 2 and 4 years ago. I believe that is fair and reasonable, and I think you ought to support it. Now there are other items of so-called representation in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, about the only reason for this legislation is described in the hearings on the bill.

The witness says, and I quote:

In order to do their work properly, they have got to establish friendly personal relations with a broad range of people in political, business, scientific, and cultural life, with the leaders in government in power and the representatives of political groups which may themselves come to power.

Mr. Chairman, if we have to use this method in our attempt to get along with the heads of other nations, then we are using cheap methods in trying to make agreements with people of foreign nations.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is only to cut \$200,000. But it is at least some reduction. The fact of the matter is that I would strike it all out, if I could. The gentleman from New York understands that. But nevertheless I think he ought to go along with us on this rather moderate reduction and save \$200,000. In my opinion it would be good for our country. I do not see how in the world

or why you have to get people to drink intoxicating liquors in order to try to become friendly with them. It is not the best way, as I see it, to try to get an understanding with people wherever they are—in America or anywhere else.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the able chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, which would cut these allowances back to \$400,000, there would not be a cookie left in the State Department.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There would not be what?

Mr. ROONEY. A cookie.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, let us not let this thing get out of hand. Let us just cut this \$200,000. It is a comparatively small amount. Let us reduce it down to \$400,000. I hope the members of this committee will see fit to support my amendment. I think it is only fair that we save \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money. They will appreciate our saving at least that much especially when it is not for a necessary cause. So vote to save \$200,000 for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6871) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6870, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, with the intention of asking that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

(1) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Senate."

(2) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Salaries, officers and employees."

(3) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$5,000."

(4) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of

Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 3 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, \$8,000."

(5) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, \$2,000."

(6) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Contingent expenses of the Senate."

(7) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, \$25,000."

(8) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, \$820,000."

(9) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$2,000."

(10) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$4,000."

(11) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the same bill that we passed in the House yesterday, with the addition of \$871,000, which the other body has added for their own housekeeping items, and those are the items that were first put in by the Senate in the urgent deficiency bill which is still in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. It is the bill we passed yesterday, with the addition of some housekeeping items by the Senate. Of course, between the two Houses, we do not interfere with housekeeping items of the other body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res.

310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 and for other purposes, which is a resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations in lieu of the first urgent deficiency appropriation bill which has been in conference for some time and on which the House and Senate conferees have not agreed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this proposition contains everything in difference between the two Houses with three exceptions. One is the strategic minerals amendment. Another is the cotton seed feed amendment. In addition it divides equally between the House and Senate the limitation on funds that can be used for local and State administration in connection with grants to States for public assistance under the Social Security Administration. Of course, we have taken out of it the Senate housekeeping items to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], just referred, and which were carried in the bill just agreed to by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the following sums:

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural conservation program service

Emergency Conservation Measures

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes, \$15 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

Farmers' Home Administration

Disaster Loan Revolving Fund

Not to exceed \$15 million of the disaster loan revolving fund established under the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a-1 to 1148a-3), may be used for emergency feed and seed assistance under section 2 (d) of said act in addition to, and under the same conditions as, the amount made available under this head in the Third Sup-

Public Law 85-15
85th Congress, H. R. 6870
April 16, 1957

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, namely:

Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957.

71 Stat. 11.

71 Stat. 12.

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", for plant and animal disease and pest control, not to exceed \$950,000, to be derived by transfer from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants): *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), and the Act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148), to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions.

31 USC 665.

52 Stat. 844.

68 Stat. 717.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

49 Stat. 1364.

7 USC 903.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways (trust fund)", to remain available until expended, not more than \$250,000,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)", to remain available until expended, \$900,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

71 Stat. 12. For an additional amount for "Fighting forest fires", \$5,000,000,
71 Stat. 13. and in addition not to exceed \$1,500,000 may be transferred to this appropriation from any appropriation, for the fiscal year 1957, available to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses (exclusive of such appropriations which include funds for grants).

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses", \$300,000.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

68 Stat. 652. For an additional amount for "Grants to States and other agencies",
29 USC 32. for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$1,500,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

70 Stat. 427 The amount authorized by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957, to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$97,000,000" to "\$121,500,000".

CHAPTER VI
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT
(Out of postal fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", \$41,000,000.

CHAPTER VII
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
SENATE

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$5,000.

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over three million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over nine million, the population of said State having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$8,000.

71 Stat. 13.

71 Stat. 14.

Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over nine million, the population of said State having exceeded nine million inhabitants, \$2,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, \$25,000.

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, \$820,000.

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$2,000.

Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$4,000.

Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, \$5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

For an additional amount for "Special and Select Committees",
\$290,000.

Approved April 16, 1957.